

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE

A standard linear barcode is positioned vertically on the left side of the label. It consists of vertical black lines of varying widths on a white background.

3 1761 02159306 6

46



57-

THE HISTORY OF
THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND

HISTORY
OF
THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND

FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII. TO
THE DEATH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH

A.D. 1509-1603

BY
MARY H. ALLIES

“Je crois volontiers les histoires dont les témoins se font égorger”
— PASCAL, *Pensées*

LONDON: BURNS & OATES, LIMITED
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO: BENZIGER BROTHERS

Emprimatur.

HERBERTUS CARDINALIS VAUGHAN,
ARCHEPISCOPUS WESTMONAST.

Datum Londini, die 8 Jan., 1895.

Salvete flores Martyrum
Spes et Decor Patriæ.

CONTENTS.

	CHAPTER	PAGE
The Defender of the Faith (A.D. 1509-1527),	-	1
CHAPTER I.		
The Royal Supremacy (1527-1534),	-	21
CHAPTER II.		
The Destroyer of the Faith (1534-1547),	-	45
CHAPTER III.		
Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer (1547-1553),	-	86
CHAPTER IV.		
Mary the Catholic (1553-1558),	-	109
CHAPTER V.		
Elizabeth--Before Excommunication (1558-1570),	-	131
CHAPTER VI.		
The First Anglican Hierarchy (1559),	-	164
CHAPTER VII.		
Elizabeth—After Excommunication (1570-1588),	-	188
CHAPTER VIII.		
Churches and the Church (1588-1603),	-	222
CHAPTER IX.		

CHAPTER I.

THE DEFENDER OF THE FAITH.—A.D. 1509-1527.

“OPPOSITION to papal authority was familiar to men ; but a spiritual supremacy, an ecclesiastical headship, as it separated Henry VIII. from all his predecessors by an immeasurable interval, so was it without precedent and at variance with all tradition.”¹ The causes which led to this spiritual supremacy were in Henry himself, whilst they were developed by peculiar circumstances. The young king, who in April, 1509, succeeded a cool, calculating, unattractive father, found England, in fact, recovering from a crisis. Every word and act of Henry VII. had contributed to strengthen the royal hand, whether for good or evil, and a situation singular in the annals of English history favoured his policy. The Wars of the Roses had produced little short of a revolution, whilst practically they had not affected moneyed interests. Neither famine, pestilence, nor high prices had followed in their wake. Their results as “wars of a class” were apparent all through the Tudor reign. The old nobility, the bulwark of the people, because of the lawful resistance they offered to a sovereign’s unjust demands,

¹ Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, i., 73.

were exterminated, and the empty ranks could not be filled by royal patents. Henry VII. aggrandised the power of the throne, which thus stood in solitary grandeur, and accumulated a treasure fed by rebellion and attainders. “Treason was more profitable to him than any other branch of his revenue,”¹ and there was no check upon its use and abuse. The new nobility were servants of the crown, and for them the “exclusive road to promotion was through the king”. Henry VII. discovered the situation, grasped it, and made it serve the royal purpose; but with his son, the personal position he had partly found, partly made, was strengthened by a singularly attractive personality. Prince Henry, at eighteen, was irresistible for the mass of Englishmen. They judged his mind from his open, handsome face, and centred their hopes in him. Henry VII. anticipated Louis XIV. in saying, “*I am the State*”.² Under Henry VIII., the aphorism was echoed by men as well as circumstances. Prince Henry had been affianced in 1503 to Katherine of Aragon, the young wife of Prince Arthur.³ In 1505, in order to hasten the payment of Katherine’s dowry, King Henry had recourse to subterfuge. Prince Henry, at his father’s bidding, signed a protest against a contract of marriage, which had been made in his name during his minority. The Prince of Wales cared so little about the document, that he did not even read it. Whilst

¹ Brewer, p. 70.

² “*L’Etat, c’est moi.*”

³ It is not correct to call her Prince Arthur’s widow.

protesting of his own free action, he was merely carrying out his father's policy.¹ Later on he disclosed his true sentiments. He greatly desired to marry Katherine, and before marriage all the eagerness was on his side. Katherine showed no wish for a second Prince of Wales, but her love, and a very strong love, came with marriage. The sole dissentient voice raised against the union was that of Archbishop Warham, on grounds which, in this particular case, did not hold good. The Bull of Dispensation, granted by Julius II. in 1503, silenced his objections; he yielded to the Pope's supreme authority without, it seems, being intellectually convinced that he was wrong. Katherine's marriage with Arthur had not been consummated, but the Papal Bull provided even for this contingency.²

Henry's marriage took place in June, 1509, and a few days later the joint coronation of Henry and Katherine. Archbishop Warham administered the solemn coronation oath, and Henry swore to maintain the privileges and liberties of the Church, as observed by Edward the Confessor, and the kings, his ancestors.

From the first, Archbishop Warham's influence was nil, and although chancellor, he was practically superseded by Fox, Bishop of Winchester, Ruthal, Bishop of Durham, Secretary of State, and the

¹ Busch, *England unter den Tudors*, i., 213.

² *Ibid.*

youthful Wolsey.¹ In retiring from affairs, he followed his natural bent. He could no more have been a diplomatist than Wolsey could have sat inactive at home.

The young king's early education had destined him for the Church. He retained in consequence literary, if not learned, tastes, which he lost only when incapacitated by his more prominent relish for pleasure. The policy of the hour was enjoyment, a policy not sufficiently weighed in estimating the later years of Henry's reign. How much future sorrow was due to the gay days of tilt and tournament, when Henry's smile was valued as a kingdom by strong knight and fair lady, and Katherine wrote to her father: "The time is spent in feasting".² In 1510, the Spanish ambassador informed Ferdinand that Henry neglected all his duties for the pleasures of his age.³

Henry soon ceased to be a faithful husband, if he ever was, and the date of an open connection, which led to important results, is fixed at 1514. One historian,⁴ indeed, makes it 1510. Thus, a long course of unfaithfulness during the halcyon days of early manhood throws a light upon subsequent doubts and difficulties, and the alleged "scruples of conscience," which probably have deceived only a credulous pos-

¹ Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, 54, 55.

² *Ibid.*, 44.

³ Stevenson, *Henry VIII.*, in the *Month* for July, 1882.

⁴ Albert du Bois, *Katherine d'Aragon, et les Origines du Schisme Anglican.*

terity. The hapless Princess Mary was born in 1516, the single child of Katherine's who survived infancy. During her early years she was offered to Spanish or French suitor, according to the exigencies of policy. She saw the bastard Duke of Richmond surrounded by the royal state which should have been hers ; and what affected her far more than his outward position, already a marked contrast to her own, was Henry's love for the boy. In 1525, it was Henry's known wish at court that the Duke of Richmond should be his successor.¹ This scandal was exchanged for another by the young duke's premature death. Anne Boleyn's reign of power placed Mary in the most singular position ever occupied by an English princess royal. Branded with illegitimacy, cut off from her mother's love and companionship, she, the rightful heiress, had to bear the sorrows and indignities heaped upon those whose birth allows them no standing-place in this world.

In 1509, the representative sovereigns on the European chess-board were Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, Louis XII. of France, and Maximilian of Germany. The taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 had given the Crescent standing-room in Europe, and it would have been well if Christian nations could have made common cause against the great enemy of the Christian name. Self-interest,

¹ Stevenson, *Month*, August, 1882.

on the contrary, predominated in their counsels, and, strangely enough, the balance of power was maintained by the efforts of the individual prince after mastery. England had yet to make and take her place amongst European nations, and she was to do it by her foreign policy, the work not of Henry, but of Wolsey. A born diplomatist, Thomas Wolsey was the son of a respectable, though not opulent, townsman of Ipswich. He had done effectual service to Henry VII. which had brought him into notice. Henry VIII. found him Dean of Lincoln, and lost no time in attaching the young churchman to himself. He always loved or hated with terrible rapidity. Bishop of Lincoln in 1514, Archbishop of York, Cardinal with the title of St. Cecilia, and Chancellor in 1515, Wolsey was contented to exchange pastoral cares for the labours of diplomacy. When Henry or his prime-minister played off Spain against France, they were no worse than his Christian majesty. French intrigues for European supremacy dated as far back as 1333,¹ and on the death of the Emperor Maximilian in 1519, Francis I. was a formidable competitor for the prize of the Roman Empire. Henry's pretensions were carefully concealed, though no less real, and Wolsey's macchiavellian tactics could affect indifference about the very thing he had most at heart. The great evil of Wolsey's premiership was not only its mundane

¹ According to Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, ii.

character. By withdrawing the king's attention from affairs of State, that is, from the intricate machinery of government, and acting on the *Ego et rex meus*, he stimulated Henry's passion for pleasure at a time when every Catholic prince should have been qualifying himself for the double encounter of Turk and heretic. The Turk was a more deadly foe, but he worked destruction on a distant battle-field, whilst the Sovereign Pontiff held up his arms over the fight: the Lutheran error entered into hearth and home. The fatal game of politics engrossed Wolsey's soul to the disregard of moral questions which affected King and State. The Field of the Cloth of Gold (1519), which purported to make friends of two powerful monarchs and really only contributed to their pleasure, seems to us an idle waste of words and pageantry. In the following year, 1520, Luther began his open revolt. He sought to impose his Babylonian Captivity on those whom he deluded. He called upon men, in fact, to transfer their allegiance from the Pope to himself. Luther's appearance should be considered in all its surroundings. There is a remarkable analogy between the state of Germany and England in the century immediately preceding the great Apostasy. In both countries the Church was rich, and its high places were in the hands of a worldly minority. The German prince-bishop had his counterpart in the lord, spiritual and temporal, who paid exaggerated court

to the king, and cared little for his flock. Bishops nominated by the king, and looking to him for promotion, were too apt to become “royal officials”.¹ Yet in Germany, as in England, the middle and lower classes exhibited solid goods of character and mind. Flourishing schools, works of art, a virtuous and learned clergy, the invention of Güttenberg, testified in Germany to a movement due to the labours of the Church. Intellectual progress, by which I mean the joint-action of faith and genius, was retarded for at least fifty years by the errors of the sixteenth century. Faith and genius generated the earlier humanists, with whom the fear of God was the beginning of wisdom. In Germany, before 1500, the Vulgate had been reproduced nearly a hundred times through the printing-press, and such men as Cardinal Nicholas von Cues and Rudolf Agricola enkindled the flame of knowledge with the torch of faith. The later humanists rested on knowledge without faith. Erasmus is their exponent, and Erasmus is the Voltaire of his period.² It is difficult to say how much Erasmus believed, and this admission by itself supposes the ground-work of faith to have been wanting. He was induced without having a vocation to enter a religious order. Subsequently he was secularised by the Pope, but

¹ Friedmann, *Anne Boleyn*, i., p. 137.

² Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, ii., p. 10. Janssen's words are: “Man hat Erasmus wohl den Voltaire der Renaissance gennant”.

his priesthood still remained. He scarcely ever said Mass, rarely heard it, scorned his Breviary, and disregarded fasting and abstinence. He spent his life as a man of letters at large, soliciting the munificence of princes and of the wealthy, and died at last without the Sacraments.¹ In his character, at least, whatever his talents were, Erasmus should have been no leader of men.

In England the humanist movement received the name of the new learning. It was new in so far as new forces were in the field, but the impulse was not new. English humanists represent the outcome of Catholic thought, and they would have founded an important school under favourable circumstances. The Tudors made courtiers, but it is questionable whether they made thinkers, or even allowed men to think.

Dean Colet, the friend and confessor of Sir Thomas More, founded St. Paul's School, and died prematurely in 1519. If he had lived long enough there is little doubt that he would have shared the sufferings and the crown of Cardinal Fisher and Thomas More. A humanist of the early school through his love of simplicity, of learning, and of Scripture, he was the sworn enemy of those evils which characterised in England, as in Germany, the close union of Church and State. In his address to Convocation at St. Paul's in 1512 he throws a light upon future

¹ Hergenröther, *Kirchenlexicon*, iv., Artikel, "Erasmus von Rotterdam".

events to which existing causes lent their aid. *O avaritia, mater omnis iniquitatis*, was his exordium. Catholics, he said, did the work of heretics by their bad lives. “ Since churchmen have adopted a secular way of living through this most abominable spirit of worldliness, the root of all spiritual life, charity itself, is no more.”¹

The evil of non-resident pastors tended to promote “ the most abominable spirit of worldliness ”. During Henry’s reign five sees were held by Italians, *viz.*, Bath and Wells, Hereford, Landaff, Salisbury, and Worcester.² Although distasteful to the English, it is difficult to understand how the Italians were worse than the English non-resident pastors. Wolsey, for instance, had never visited his northern diocese till driven there by sorrow and the king’s disfavour. The first men of the new learning are suggestive of Henry’s title, *Defender of the Faith*. Reared and nurtured on Catholic thought and philosophy, they yet were at an earlier stage of the Church’s unfolding than we are. Sir Thomas More, whose name was in the mouth of Europe, spent seven years considering the claims of the Papacy to be a Divine institution, and, what is almost as baffling, he was the sworn friend of Erasmus. Did the undoubted scholarship of Erasmus lead Sir Thomas to overlook his moral deficiencies, his shallowness, his vanity, his prema-

¹ The text of Colet’s address is to be found in his *Life*, by Knight, Appendix.

² Stevenson, *Henry VIII.*, in *Month*, July, 1882.

ture adoration of the Goddess Reason ? However this may be, Erasmus was made welcome at the Chelsea home, and it entertained no suspicion of his real nature. It is the more curious because, at a time when probably no man knew Henry VIII., Sir Thomas had taken a prophetical measure of his sovereign. The head, which was not required for the castle in France, was not spared when it interfered with the king's passion. He read through the master he served, but apparently he did not read through Erasmus, who, it is true, showed a most amiable side of his character to his Chelsea friend. In John Fisher England possessed one of the holiest bishops of Europe and a foremost humanist. Love of learning led him also to friendship for Erasmus, who seemed at that time its personification. Neither the holy Bishop of Rochester nor the brilliant Sir Thomas More diagnosed the man.

Grocyn, Linacre, the king's physician, and Reginald Pole, his cousin, belonged to the early school of humanists. Religious troubles in England nipped the movement in the bud. In the first place, Cromwell's reign of terror made learning extremely difficult. When he and it had passed the tyranny of Henry remained. Learning of a certain kind was conspicuous in the boy-king Edward VI., and still more in his sister Elizabeth, but it was learning without faith, and this characterised the later school of humanism inaugurated by Erasmus. As in Germany, it was distinctly opposed to the Church, and

produced rather men full of their own conceits than men wise with sobriety. They who had mocked at schoolmen and at mediæval achievements were the authors of humanism in its worst form, an exaggerated regard for classical language and modes of thought, which was no less than a return to old heathenism. The second movement was as deeply infidel as the first had been profoundly Christian.

Warham, the natural head of the hierarchy in England, had resigned the great seal into the hands of Wolsey, who, as cardinal, took precedence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Warham patronised learning, and won the praise of Erasmus, but it must be admitted that his career was somewhat colourless till its close. He was made for the duties of peace, a quiet life, and *otium cum dignitate*, harmless tastes in themselves, yet fatal at certain hours of history when they impede the good fight. Warham, however, has left on record an admirable statement with regard to the rights of the Sovereign Pontiff in the institution of bishops.¹ Henry VIII. was affected by the new learning, and up to a certain point was himself a humanist. His early education for the Church had given him a taste for theologising. When, therefore, in 1520, Luther denounced the Church as the Babylonian Captivity, and called upon men to follow him, the inventor of a new religion with more than papal faculties, Henry was moved to prove at once his learning and his ortho-

¹ See p. 37 of this History.

doxy. Had Christendom at large answered Luther by deed, it is possible he might never have made this invention of his. The influence of the new learning was everywhere before men; and Henry, as one of its exponents, met argument by argument. Many have done the same before and since, and ended, as Henry did, by falling into the errors of his opponent. He answered Luther by his pen, not by his life, and this is the whole secret of his failure. The pen at least was Henry's own, and did the work well. Sir Thomas More furnished it with an index, which was his sole part in the book.¹ The royal treatise on the Seven Sacraments appeared in 1521, and Leo X. conferred upon Henry in consequence the title still published on every coin of the realm, F.D., *Fidei Defensor*. As far as genuine authorship went, Henry had fairly won his honours. He possessed sufficient theological knowledge and acumen to explain the Seven Sacraments dogmatically, whilst all the time he was trampling one of them under his feet by his licentious life. His example belied his pen.

Anne Boleyn found the soil ready prepared to drink in her arts and devices when in 1522 she made her first appearance at court. She was the daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn and of Lady Elizabeth Boleyn, a sister of the Duke of Norfolk, whose birth was her sole claim to nobility. Anne had accompanied the king's sister, Mary, to France, and

¹ *Blessed Thomas More*, by Fr. Bridgett, p. 210.

had never known a mother's true care and love. She came, in fact, from one licentious court to another. Her father was a mere courtier, able and willing to carry out Henry's desires, both at home and abroad. In 1525 he was raised to the peerage as Viscount Rochford. The Boleyn family had exceptionally good opportunities of knowing Henry as he really was. Anne had seen her sister, Mary, courted, then thrown aside, by the king's caprice; and there is reason to believe that he had similarly trifled with Lady Elizabeth Boleyn.¹ In all her intercourse with the king, Anne had Mary Boleyn before her eyes; and from the first she was determined not to share the same fate. Unscrupulous as she was clever, she fascinated Henry all the more for seeming to draw back from his advances. Queen Katherine was wont to spend much of her time in her own apartments, and probably her retirement was imposed. She could not countenance what went on by her presence, and in this she was imitated by Henry's true friends, Sir Thomas More and the Bishop of Rochester. Already in 1524 Anne had parted the king and queen for ever.² She had broken the strong and sacred bond between husband and wife, a figure of the greater severing which was to fall upon the whole nation. When

¹ Fr. Stevenson discredits Sander's hideous story, but establishes the bad character borne by Lady Elizabeth Boleyn. *Month*, Sept., 1882.

² Stevenson, *Month*, Sept., 1882.

she had sufficiently felt her way, she, and she alone, suggested marriage with the king. The crown matrimonial was what she meant to wear; love for Henry she had none. Wolsey cannot be exculpated. In 1527, when the divorce began to be openly bruited, the cardinal, at the king's urgent command, broke off Anne's proposed marriage to Lord Percy. He connived all along at Anne's presence, and the sole excuse which can be alleged for him is that he knew his master's habits. Experience made him hope that Anne's ignoble honours would cease with the king's passion—in a word, that she would follow her sister Mary.

Before Anne's affairs became sufficiently important to attract the special notice of Wolsey his ambition determined his attitude to the Pope: the churchman was swamped by the diplomatist. In 1518 four papal legates were nominated to obtain a subsidy against the Turk from European powers. Cardinal Campeggio was allotted to England. Wolsey, who had been trying for two years to extract from Leo X. legatine faculties for himself, took an ungenerous advantage of the opportunity to force the Pope's hand. He dictated the terms of Campeggio's reception to his agent in Rome. Campeggio's mission was to be restricted to the one object in view, and he himself was to be associated to the Italian cardinal with equal legatine faculties. Otherwise, he intimated in the king's name and his own, Campeggio would not be received in England. The

Pope gave way at last to the pressure put upon him, and Wolsey became papal legate.¹ The history of the faculties so obtained is in keeping with their origin. Wolsey began by ousting Campeggio, and taking the first place. He then obtained those special powers of visitation which put him in the position of a permanent legate *a latere*. Power both civil and ecclesiastical was thus more and more concentrated in one hand.

The Convocation of Canterbury met in 1522 to carry out reforms in the Church. What these were does not transpire.² The more prominent business was the consideration of a grant to the king. The clergy were called upon to give him half the value of livings for five years; foreigners in possession of English sees were to give the whole, to which measure six exceptions were made, Erasmus amongst the number. Wolsey extracted some kind of a consent, but the clergy bore him a grudge for his hard pressure, and for his clever diplomacy. Another act of Wolsey's ecclesiastical policy made him unpopular with the Regulars. It is possible that when he turned his attention to the suppression of religious houses he was actuated by worldly wisdom, and that he saw farther ahead than his contemporaries. It is certain that his scheme was suggested and carried out on very different grounds to the general dissolutions of 1536, yet the precedent was most unfor-

¹ Gasquet, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, i., p. 70.

² Collier, *History*, iv., p. 53.

tunate. Wolsey showed in the measure his usual energy of purpose. He adopted it on the principle of commutation, and later on made it serve his personal ends. The suppressions were inaugurated in 1521 by that of Bromehall, in the Diocese of Salisbury, and Lillechurch, in the Diocese of Rochester, both convents of nuns. Some reasonable grounds for dissolution may have been alleged, and it is certain that Blessed John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, counselled it, a detail which gave particular satisfaction to Henry and Wolsey. The revenues of both priories were granted to St. John's College, Cambridge.

Then, as now, there was a fashion in almsgiving, which imposed itself upon the successful men of the day. Even Wolsey could not disregard it, nor allow his enemies to say that he built only splendid palaces. It was incumbent on him either to build a college or to forward the work of education. In order to meet the outlay, he had recourse to further suppressions, which he carried out in spite of popular ill-feeling, wrenching bulls from Pope Clement VII. whose injunctions he disregarded. The Pope provided that the consent of the king and the various founders of these religious houses should be obtained. The inhabitants of Tunbridge strongly objected to the dissolution of their Augustinian Canons, and at Beigham Abbey, in Sussex, the agents for the suppression were turned out by the people. The odium attached to these proceedings, on the part of the

richest man in the kingdom,¹ was increased by his choice of men to execute his pleasure. "For God's sake use mercy with those friars," had been the Pope's warning, but where was mercy in the hands of Allen and Cromwell of future fame? They used none. They were bent on pleasing Wolsey at whatever cost to the religious whose houses they visited. They extorted what they could for the magnificent cardinal, or rather for his college at Oxford. "The Bull allowing Wolsey to suppress monasteries to the value of 3000 ducats a year, for the purpose of adding to the funds of his college, left Rome on 12th September, 1524."² Early in the following year the active work of suppression began. From first to last, forty lesser religious houses were dissolved.³ The Ipswich foundation was made only to be unmade, for it soon passed into private dwelling-houses, whilst the mark of its founder still rests on Christchurch College.

European events diverted Wolsey's attention from minor points of interest at home. At a time when evils so great threatened Christendom, the spirit of the crusades had disappeared; there was no health in princes who looked for personal profit from its throes. Henry had not given up the vain dream of his predecessors for the French Crown. He was secretly allied with Charles against Francis I. After the Battle of Pavia, in 1525, his tactics changed.

¹ Gasquet, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, vi., p. 88.

² *Ibid.*, p. 84.

³ Collier.

Seeing that he was to gain nothing from the success of Charles, he again approached the French. In the meantime, Clement VII. saw in the Roman Emperor the sworn enemy of Italy.¹ He feared the victorious arms of Charles, and that Pavia would be a prelude to the taking of Milan and the loss of Italian independence. With a true instinct against the dynasty, he erred in his personal diagnosis.

Charles was a better man than Francis I.; his faith was genuine, whereas Francis made no account of the Christian religion, and secretly allied himself with the Sultan for temporal aggrandisement. This was the sovereign chosen by Clement as his ally in place of Charles. Francis swore to observe the treaty of Madrid, by which he renounced the Duchy of Burgundy, but no sooner was he set free than he broke his faith. In May, 1526, he entered into a league with Clement VII., Venice, Florence, and Duke Sforza of Milan, to which Henry promised active contribution. It was, in fact, a defensive league against the Emperor, in whom Clement saw the disturber of equilibrium both in Italy and in Christendom. He paid a heavy price for his policy. The following year, 1527, the imperial troops took and sacked Rome. Then, as now, the Holy Father was a prisoner in his own city. He retired into the fastnesses of St. Angelo. The very thing which he had feared came about, and he lost all independence,

¹ See Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, vol. iii., Erstes Buch.

save that which God has attached to his spiritual office. At St. Angelo, as later on at Orvieto, he was bound metaphorically hand and foot. Of the Christian princes whom he had sought to fire against the Turk, Charles alone rose to anything akin to enthusiasm. France and England were ready to swoop vulture-like upon the prey. Wolsey's diplomatic mind had overshot the mark. He had directed a policy, shifting in a Catholic prince, outwardly glorious for England ; and when forced to take cognisance of events at home, he remembered too late that he himself was a prince of the Church. Never in the "great matter" which was now the common talk of England did he exhort Henry to act as a Christian. The Defender of the Faith was merged in Anne Boleyn's suitor.

CHAPTER II.

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY.—A.D. 1527-1534.

THE year 1527 gave publicity to the king's "great matter". What Cardinal Wolsey hoped had not come to pass. Henry clung to Anne and the "scruples of conscience," which could have deceived no one at all intimate with his court. It may be noted that in Catholic times divorce, as we now understand it, did not exist. A true marriage cannot be dissolved by any ecclesiastical law. When the aid of canonists is called in, they are required to prove that there has been no marriage at all. On those grounds alone does the Church consent to act. Nothing of the kind could be alleged by Henry. He had grown tired of his wife, and fallen in love with a woman whose ambition it was to wear a crown. Henry knew enough of canon law to be aware that his only chance lay in proving the nullity of his marriage with Katherine. As to conscience, a long course of infidelity had weakened his capacity of listening to it. What now made itself heard was the voice of passion. Henry, then, being no longer able to contain his infatuation for Anne Boleyn, declared that his tender conscience must be dealt with, and that

the Pope should relax the sixth commandment in his favour. This is what disturbed the course of public events, sent bishops or courtiers on ignoble missions to Rome, threatened to destroy the hardly-won fame of Wolsey's foreign policy, and *did* destroy the cardinal himself. A diplomatist before anything, he did not shine in domestic affairs, and this particular home business was his death-blow. To speak in modern language, Wolsey was not opposed to the divorce in itself, but for state reasons he was opposed to Anne Boleyn. So important a step, he reasoned, should be productive of good ; and good, in Cardinal Wolsey's estimation, was the human glory of England. He would have welcomed a daughter of France in Katherine's place. Henry VIII. is credited with more steadfastness of purpose than he really possessed. With him it was *sit pro ratione voluntas*: Yet one thing would have saved him from himself, or at least from the public expression and sanctioning of his passion, a conscientious resistance. In all the hierarchy only one man offered it, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, whilst the two archbishops temporised.

It is said that Wolsey knelt at Henry's feet for hours, imploring him to give up the thought of marrying Anne Boleyn. When he found the king absolutely set on the business, he entered at last regretfully into Anne's cause, and determined to forward it as being his master's pleasure. On Wolsey too rests the burden of the first official steps taken in the matter. As papal legate he, in May, 1527,

summoned the king to appear at his court. Henry was to answer for living eighteen years in sin with his brother's widow.¹ Wolsey could scarcely have been ignorant of the fact, which was commonly known in England as well as in Spain, that the marriage of Katherine and Arthur had never been consummated, and that Katherine was wrongly styled a widow. With culpable weakness Warham took part in these doings, which remained entirely secret, yet gave the king undue support.

In the following July Wolsey left for France in order to break the matter gently to Francis I. His enemies, who meant to profit by his absence, were not sorry to get him out of the kingdom. "Mdlle. Anne," or "the lady," as she is called by the foreign ambassadors when they do not give her a worse name,² never forgave or forgot his personal objection to her. Wolsey stopped at Rochester on his road, and endeavoured to entrap the holy bishop into expressions adverse either to Katherine's marriage or to her conduct. In France he busied himself with marriage negotiations on behalf of Princess Mary with the King of France or the Duke of Orleans. She was then eleven years old. There was no hint of her illegitimacy, nor is it necessary to add that if there had been she would never have been offered to a royal prince of France. Not only was no slur cast on her birth, but she was publicly

¹ Zimmermann, *Pater A, Kardinal Pole*, p. 28.

² *La concubine.*

recognised as Henry's heiress. Hence the importance of her marriage, and the unpopularity to the people of England of the French alliance.

The taking of Rome by the Imperialists seriously affected the temporal fortunes of Clement VII., and made him inclined to temporise and to listen to his natural affection for Henry VIII., which seems to have been very great. In the spring of 1528 he was living in great misery at Orvieto, in the dilapidated episcopal palace. It was there that he received Henry's special messengers, Bishop Fox of Winchester, and Stephen Gardiner, who were to present letters from Wolsey, and to advance the king's great matter as best they might, not losing sight of the advantage to be drawn from Clement's wretched position. To put it briefly, they were asking the Sovereign Pontiff to unmake a lawful marriage, or, if possible, to let the king have two wives at once. On 26th December, 1503, Pope Julius II. had published both a Bull and a Brief in favour of Katherine's marriage to Henry. The Bull provided for every contingency, even supposing marriage with Arthur had been consummated. To make assurance doubly sure, King Ferdinand had procured the Brief as a sort of supplementary document which had its own particular importance. It declared the marriage not consummated as a fact well known to all. Thus the *impedimentum publicæ honestatis* was fully met by Pope Julius. The Brief so wisely obtained by Ferdinand's foresight was held by Charles V. in 1528,

and never yielded up to the solicitations of the English.¹

Under the circumstances, how did Clement meet Henry's ambassadors? By kind words, and by kind words only. He would do all he could, he said, for the king, their master, but he could pledge himself to nothing until he had consulted the Cardinal *Sanctorum Quatuor*. Wolsey stooped to deception, and gave the Pope in his letters a flattering account of Anne's moral character. Report had spoken far otherwise, and from it the Holy Father had heard the truth about Anne and the state of things in England. He was delighted, as he told Gardiner and Fox, to find that report had been mistaken. Gardiner, in his desire to please the king, was carried away by his rhetoric, and he now declared, that if the Holy See did not give way to Henry's demands, England would renounce its ancient allegiance.²

Fox, who was despatched first to England, naïvely admitted, that if they had done any business, they owed it to Wolsey's letters. The Pope consented to issue a commission for hearing the cause, which was to be presided over by a special legate *a latere*. This was the result of the Orvieto negotiations. Henry and Anne were delighted; Wolsey, who knew more about it, was less well pleased. The

¹ Ehses, *Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England*, Einleitung, xxxii.

² Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, p. 255.

Pope may reasonably have tried to gain time, in the hope not only that his own position might improve, but also that the king's fancy for Anne would pass away. It must always be remembered that he was misinformed and deceived as to the chief parties concerned, and as to their motives. Clement chose Cardinal Lawrence Campeggio to preside with Wolsey over the legatine court. Campeggio had been in England ten years before as the first legate *a latere* since the days of Edward II. The loss of his wife had induced Campeggio to give up a brilliant career, and to enter the Church. His experience of the world, together with his grasp of canon law, made him singularly fit to determine difficult questions. No cardinal under Clement VII. had given proof of greater activity in the service of the Holy See. On one of his missions he had contracted the gout, which made him a constant and acute sufferer. Even his malady, distressing as it was to himself, furthered the Pope's policy of checking the combined eagerness of Wolsey and Henry. Campeggio was already Bishop of Salisbury, and did not come to England without a thorough knowledge of the case in hand. Before he was chosen as special legate Pope Clement had done him the honour of consulting him in the matter. "If," says Campeggio in his reply, "the impediments were expressed at the time of the marriage, and the dispensation was sufficient, there is no sort of doubt that the marriage was and is valid, and

that it cannot be annulled on any condition whatever.”¹

The case was perfectly simple, and could have been solved at once if the truth and nothing but the truth had been told. Whilst Campeggio was treating Henry as a man of honour, Henry did not scruple to deceive the papal legate when it served his purpose. It may also be doubted whether Campeggio sufficiently took into account the element of passion. “I believe if an angel were to come down from heaven he could not alter the king’s mind,”² he wrote to the Pope soon after his arrival in October, 1528.

His instructions were specific. He was to do all he could to reconcile the king and the queen, or rather the king to the queen, and he was not to take any decisive action without orders from Rome. Never was papal legate so tormented. Between his gout, Wolsey, and the king, he literally had no peace. Katherine showed a royal dignity and firmness. She was a wife and mother, and she would not listen to Campeggio’s proposition, that she should retire into a convent. He probably urged it, just as the Pope had consented to the commission, as a temporary measure. Wolsey, all fire and ardour for the divorce, chafed at the slowness of Campeggio, who was tortured by gout and tied by orders to protract the matter as long as he could: “If haply

¹ Ehses, *Campeggio an Clemens VII.*, 14th Dec., 1527, p. 12.

² *Ibid.*, 54.

God shall put into the king's heart some holy thought, so that he may not desire from his Holiness a thing which cannot be granted without injustice, peril, and scandal".

Katherine's firmness, the badness of Henry's cause, even Campeggio's sufferings from gout, helped on delay after delay. Six months passed away ; Katherine was still queen, and although time had been gained, Anne yet reigned over Henry's heart, and at Greenwich her reign had practically begun. At this juncture the Pope fell dangerously sick, and for the time every other interest subsided. The death of Clement, and the appointment of his successor, were possibilities which Henry contemplated with the greatest keenness. Charles V. finally resolved to espouse his aunt's cause, and petitioned the Pope to remove the commission from England, where justice was dealt out to her with a sparing hand. The delay in a matter which he had supposed would be so easy served to convince Henry of its extreme difficulty, and it is said that for one moment he wavered.

At last, on 31st May, 1529, the legatine court opened with great pomp. It is impossible to ignore that, diplomatist as he was, Campeggio was not proof against Henry's hypocrisy, when he told the court he acted only at the dictates of conscience.¹ The queen appeared on 21st June, and in the strength of her cause and her good conscience she knelt at

¹ Ehses, *Campeggio an Salriati*, 21st June, 1529.

Henry's feet, and pleaded in her broken English for a hearing and for justice. It was a foregone conclusion on his part that she was to have neither, and so Katherine found. Rising from her knees, she appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff, and, placing her cause unreservedly in his hands, left the hall, supported by her general receiver. It was in vain that "Katherine, Queen of England," was invited to come back into court. Yet, failing Campeggio, who was acting under orders, she had one ardent champion in her adopted country. If the whole hierarchy had stood by the queen, they would only have done their duty; nevertheless, that particular duty, under the circumstances, was little short of heroism. It meant the abiding anger of Henry Tudor, and all that it involved. On 28th June, then, the Bishop of Rochester declared his conviction, after two years' study for the satisfaction of his conscience, that the king's marriage was valid, and could be broken by neither human nor Divine law; that he was prepared to shed his blood for the sanctity of this marriage. He would be following in the footsteps of St. John the Baptist if he thus lay down his life; only, that through the Blood of our Lord, marriage was a holier ordinance now than then. These were prophetic words, but the holy bishop did Henry far too much honour in supposing that he wanted truth and justice. He wanted Anne Boleyn, at any price. Standish, Bishop of St. Asaph, spoke to the same purport as Fisher, though with less warmth and

earnestness. The rest of the hierarchy uttered no word, or rather Wolsey expressed his surprise and displeasure at Fisher's protest. The court rose on 23rd July. Proceedings terminated with a speech from Campeggio, in which he adjourned the court until the end of the Roman vacation in October. Katherine possessed the affection of the people in no ordinary degree, yet she could not hope for an impartial hearing before any English tribunal. If Pope Clement had wished to prove it to the world, he could not have done it more effectually than by ordering a legate *a latere* merely to hear the cause, and not to act on his own responsibility. The Holy Father achieved his object: time was gained, and Henry was not one step nearer the dissolution of his marriage. The legatine court had witnessed a queen prostrate at her husband's feet, great in her humiliation, whilst "a sovereign cited to plead before his subjects was an outrageous incongruity".¹ The court left matters exactly as it found them. Popular sympathy was with Katherine, and her rival was hated. Public opinion, such as it was in those days, knew what to think of the Boleyn connection, for which Henry had recourse to this special pleading. Cardinal Campeggio alone was slow to measure the king, though, as he wrote to Romé: "As soon as I know positively that the king is in the wrong, I am for speaking out bravely against him, even if I should die for it within an hour's time".²

¹ Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, ii., p. 344.

² Ehses, *Campeggio an Salviati*, p. 108.

Campeggio was recalled in September, 1529, and the faculties of both legates for dealing with the cause were suspended.¹ They repaired to Grafton, where Henry was staying with Anne Boleyn, Campeggio to take official leave of the king, Wolsey to bid "a long farewell to all his greatness". The Italian cardinal saw enough to convince himself that the king meant to take the law into his own hands, and Wolsey began to taste the first bitter drops of the royal displeasure. No room had been prepared for him at Grafton, and he was forced to seek shelter three miles off. Anne was at hand to counteract the effect of Wolsey's presence on Henry.

Soon the storm burst upon him in all its fury. One by one his honours fled from a minister who had failed to accomplish his master's will. He was commanded to resign the great seal, and divested of his magnificent palace, York Place. The king was not contented with the honours without the goods of his old servant. Wolsey was stripped of his possessions, his houses with their costly furniture, so that he had not wherewithal to meet his daily expenses; impoverished, and almost friendless, he was relegated to his northern see. As yet, he had been an absentee Archbishop of York, nor does it appear that he had ever visited his cathedral. His determination to be canonically installed as Archbishop of York was frustrated by his death. The

¹ Ehses, *Clement VII. an die Cardinäle Wolsey und Campeggio*, 1st Sept., 1529.

ceremony had been fixed for 7th December, 1530.¹ Some of his last months on earth were passed in an exact and edifying discharge of all his episcopal duties. He whom men had hated in his might was beloved in his lowliness. He gained the hearts of his diocesans. But dishonour and despoliation did not satisfy Henry. It was for the slaughter that the royal butcher fattened his victims, and on this occasion Anne Boleyn offered him the knife. Wolsey was summoned to London to answer a charge of high treason, and he was actually on his way to the Tower when death overtook him at Leicester Abbey, 29th November, 1530. "Had I but served God as I have served my king," he said, in dying, "He would not now have deserted me in my grey hairs." "His last words were an entreaty to Henry to preserve England in the unity of that faith in which they had both been born and educated."² Wolsey carried with him to the grave an unshaken belief in his "gracious prince," and a love that would have been stronger than death itself.

Sir Thomas More succeeded Wolsey as chancellor, and Thomas Cromwell became Secretary of State, and the favourite of the hour; a terrible favourite, who studied only Henry's passion, and hacked down before it both men and things. By trade an adventurer, he had been engaged in "getting on" from a very early period of his career. During six years he had been a member of Wolsey's household, and

¹ Stevenson, *Month*, Jan., 1883.

² *Ibid.*

most of the technicalities concerning the cardinal's suppressions had passed through his hands. His novitiate in suppressions was to lead to profession. He used the knowledge acquired in Wolsey's service for Henry. He seems to have had a sort of attachment for Wolsey, who doubtless served him as a stepping-stone to fame, and he was faithful at heart to the Catholic religion. When the false glamour of the world was over, and it was no longer a question of getting on, but of dying, he proclaimed to all the faith which, he said, he had never doubted. He signalled his advent to power by a daring suggestion, in which, as it will be seen, there was no Catholic conscience.

After Campeggio's departure, and Wolsey's disgrace, the sense of defeat was brought home to Henry. In spite of all that his agents on the continent could do in buying, or otherwise securing, judgments favourable to his alliance with Anne, the fact remained that the popular voice was against him. The Boleyns had no intention of being dropped, nor did Anne mean to be trifled with, and her threats of leaving the king were merely devices to draw him on. On the other hand, how could Henry act against the Christian instinct, and without the Pope's consent? Cromwell solved the puzzle. He sought and obtained an audience, and found Henry and the hour ripe for the evil counsels which he offered, he said, in all diffidence, rather than behold the anxiety of his sovereign. Nothing

was wanting except the Pope's approval, and for the sake of that approval, was Henry to forfeit his rights? Let him imitate the princes of Germany, who had thrown off the yoke of Rome; let him, with the authority of Parliament, declare himself the head of the Church within his own realm. At present, England was a monster with two heads. If the king could take the spiritual power into his own hands, and refer his case to his own authority, every difficulty would vanish. Henry listened with surprise and pleasure, thanked Cromwell for his advice, and acted upon it.¹ Cromwell's favour dates from the birth of the Anglican heresy, the hour when Henry consented to his suggestion, and transferred spiritual allegiance from the Holy See to himself. Thus born in 1530, the Royal Supremacy was officially imposed only some years later, for very obvious reasons. It was not to be expected that the clergy would accept the anomaly without, at least, a protest. Cromwell, who invented the Royal Supremacy, devised a plan for breaking down their opposition. Wolsey had been accused of *Præmunire*, and the clergy, it was argued, by admitting his legatine jurisdiction, had become "his fautors and abettors," and were likewise involved in it. Convocation assembled hastily, and offered the king a bribe of £100,000 in exchange for a free pardon. Henry would not accept these terms unless the clergy would acknowledge him "to be the

¹ Lingard, vi., 177.

protector and only supreme head of the Church and clergy of England". Lord Rochford and Cromwell appeared at Convocation, endeavouring to overawe its proceedings. They were the lay officers of the Crown in its new aspect of supreme head. Finally, Warham moved an amendment, which was carried by both Convocations, February, 1531. The clause within a parenthesis ran, "as far as the law of Christ will allow," and invalidated the concession.¹ Cromwell's defeat could not be called brilliant, neither had he succeeded. After the Convocation of 1531 "the spiritual supremacy of the Pope was still admitted, his name still preceded that of the king in the public prayers of the Church, and the bishops still continued to receive their institutions from Rome as heretofore. Sacraments and services were ministered as usual to the faithful."²

The question mooted in this Convocation alarmed Sir Thomas More, and led to his resignation of the chancellorship in May, 1532. He foresaw evil days against which he could protest only by retiring, and he rightly concluded that he could no longer conscientiously hold the great seal. In the quiet of his Chelsea home he prepared himself day by day for the crisis which was at hand.

The sees of York and Winchester had remained vacant since Wolsey's death, because Henry wished to show honour to Reginald Pole, and so to gain

¹ Collier, iv., 178, and Lingard, vi., 178.

² Stevenson, *Month*, April, 1883.

him to the Boleyn cause. Pole was offered the Archbishopric of York, but declined for the same reason which made Sir Thomas More resign. York was bestowed on Lee, and Winchester on Stephen Gardiner, whose recommendation was not *fortiter in re suaviter in modo*. So far, he had shown himself far too zealous for the king's behests.

Henry's true friends, then, were forced by his conduct to withdraw from affairs. Reginald Pole fled the country, and received later on a mark of the king's friendship. Henry's bitter persecution of the Poles, in consequence of Reginald's refusal to be gained, had its parallel in his behaviour to the ex-chancellor. When Sir Thomas More heard that the king had graciously commuted his sentence of high treason to the penalty of beheading, he wittily exclaimed : "Then, God save my friends from any more of his Majesty's favours".

In the meantime Cromwell, a man without honour or moral sense, reaped the rewards *not* lavished upon the king's friends.

Warham's protest in Convocation would have produced results had he lived. In the early part of 1532 he drew up a document in answer to an impending charge of *Præmunire*. In reality, his crime was his refusal to acknowledge Henry's spiritual supremacy ; ostensibly it was a breach of *Præmunire*. In 1518 he had consecrated Henry Standish to the see of St. Asaph before the Bishop-elect had shown the papal Bulls to the king, and

taken his oath of fealty to the Crown. The Archbishop, therefore, restricted himself to the charge. If, says Warham, the Archbishop of Canterbury should not give the spiritualities till the king's grace had been granted them, then the episcopal power would depend on the prince, *which is against all law*. It would be in a manner as good to have no spiritualities at all as to hold them at the prince's pleasure. Consequently, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who should hold in his hands the spiritualities of a bishop duly appointed in consistory till the king had delivered the temporalities, would be doing grievous hurt and injury to that bishop. *It is the Pope's nomination in consistory which constitutes the bishop.*¹

There is every reason to believe that Archbishop Warham would have laid down his life for the Holy See with the Bishop of Rochester and Sir Thomas More. He died on 23rd August, 1532, and Henry did not fail to take advantage of the great opportunity thus offered him of securing a pliant archbishop. He chose Thomas Cranmer, who had been chaplain to the Boleyns, and had espoused their cause with all that it represented. He was a Protestant at heart, as he clearly proved, by setting at nought any and every Catholic dogma, which chanced to interfere with the king's pleasure. The indissolubility of marriage, the authority of the Holy See,

¹ See *Dublin Review*, for April, 1894. Article by Canon Moyes.

Transubstantiation, the Priesthood, all these he gave up in word and act. He was married in spite of the canons. If it be true that Henry altered his coronation oath,¹ Cranmer could vie with him. The Archbishop-elect was called upon to take the customary oath of obedience to the Holy See. He had no intention of keeping it, so before consecration, he uttered a protest in London against the oath his proctor in Rome had taken in his name. Accompanied by a notary and four witnesses, he retired into a private chapel, and there declared that he did not intend to bind himself to anything against "God, the king, and his country". Upon the arrival of the Bulls, therefore, he was consecrated by the Bishops of Lincoln, Exeter, and St. Asaph.² Catholic formulas, not then mutilated, and papal confirmation, made the perjured man Archbishop of Canterbury. Henry expressed his feelings on the subject in his own peculiar coarseness of language: "Now I have the right sow by the ear". His spiritual headship did not require an archbishop, and Cranmer, in fact, somewhat resembled the officer created by the first Napoleon, a minister of public worship. Its invention was due to Anne Boleyn, and it progressed with her suit. The history of the years 1530-1534 shows that the one kept pace with the other.

In 1532 Clement issued a prohibitive Bull to Henry, in which he conjured the king to receive

¹ This is asserted by Audin, *Histoire de Henri VIII.*

² Collier, iv., 210, and Stevenson, April, 1883.

his lawful queen, and to put away “a certain Anne” (*quandam Annam*),¹ who had usurped her place. The king’s passion first, then Cromwell, and, lastly, the minister of public worship, Cranmer, had taught him to turn a deaf ear to the Pope. Anne was created Marchioness of Pembroke in September 1532, with remainder to the heirs of her body.² A few months later, in order to secure the legitimacy of her expected child, the king proceeded to marriage with her. It took place privately at Whitehall on 25th January, 1533. Henry assured Dr. George Brown who officiated, that he held the papal dispensation in an adjoining cabinet. This subterfuge was merely adopted to secure his end. He still kept up a show of deference towards the real spiritual Head, although, so far as his own conduct was concerned, he had set up his own supremacy. At that time its institution was too recent to be imposed on the general public. In the following May, the ever-ready Cranmer pronounced the king’s marriage with Katherine invalid, and that with Anne his true and legitimate matrimony. She was solemnly crowned on 1st June, 1533. In July Pope Clement once more exhorted Henry to return to his duty, and to part from Anne. Unless by October they had separated, the king would be *ipso facto* excommunicated. Princess Elizabeth, born in September, 1533, was

¹ Pocock, *Records of the Reformation*, ii., p. 166.

² Friedmann (*Anne Boleyn*) supposes they cohabited from this date.

in virtue of Cranmer's sentence presumptive heiress to the crown to the exclusion of Princess Mary.

Henry's passion for Anne Boleyn, "Mrs. Boleyn," as Collier quaintly calls one who was neither Mrs. nor Miss, cooled with possession, whilst it was most truly *initium malorum*. Each year marked a retrogression; the bad harvest, morally, of 1534 was remarkable. First came the Pope's final sentence to the effect that Katherine was Henry's true wife, thus annulling Dr. George Brown's apology for a marriage, and declaring that Anne was no queen of England, in spite of the crown set on her brow. Before the papal decision became known in England, Henry had already "transubstantiated himself into the Pope".¹ What it behoved him now to do was to give the transubstantiation force of law, and to this end he found Parliament as servile and abject as Cranmer. The spring session of 1534 simply transferred the Pope's power to the sovereign.

1. The king became lord of Convocation, which could neither meet nor enact canons without the royal licence. The clergy who had protested in 1531 now accepted subordination, if not officially, at least in act, for Convocation, their usual mouth-piece, was struck dumb.

2. The king's jurisdiction was extended over all religious superiors formerly under the Pope *nullo medio*, and the Court of Chancery was substituted for the Court of Rome. The regulars, who were

¹ Bishop Andrews, quoted by Brewer, *English Studies*, p. 301.

ordered to take their appeals and grievances to the Court of Chancery, took them in reality to the king, thus constituted supreme ordinary.

3. The election of bishops was placed entirely in the king's hands. "Upon the vacancy of the see, he was to send his *congé d'écrire* to the dean and chapter, or prior, or convent, and in case they delayed their election above twelve days, the Crown was empowered to nominate the person by letters patent." The bishop so nominated took an oath of fealty to the king, who conferred both the spiritualities and the temporalities of the see.

4. No payment of any sort or kind was to be made to the Court of Rome. Here, again, the thing was not abolished, but the prohibited payments were transferred from Rome to the Crown. Queen Anne's bounty gave back to the Anglican Establishment a portion of the wealth thus appropriated from the Catholic Church.

5. The *statute de heretico comburendo* of Henry IV. was repealed, but whilst the capital punishment was retained, the king reserved to himself the faculty of punishing lapsed heretics by fire.¹ He used the privilege freely, sending real and sham heretics to death. Men were burned for denying Transubstantiation, whilst they suffered the penalties of high treason for disbelieving Cromwell's dogma of the king's spiritual supremacy.

A Bill of Attainder was passed against the unfor-

¹ Collier, iv., p. 285, and following.

tunate Maid of Kent, a nun at Canterbury, by name Elizabeth Barton, who had caused Henry considerable vexation by predicting evil days if he deserted Queen Katherine. This nun was said to have visions or trances, which produced a great impression, and she herself was looked upon as very holy. Whether her knowledge was real, or whether she was a victim to hysteria and its delusions, it is difficult to say; but, at all events, her worst transgressions were imprudence and indiscretion. For this, she and her counsellors, Fathers Rich and Risby, Observant Friars, Dr. Bocking and Dr. Dering, Benedictines of Christ Church, Canterbury, and two secular priests, were convicted of high treason, and suffered its barbarous death in May, 1534.¹ Cromwell sought to implicate the Bishop of Rochester and Sir Thomas More in the Holy Maid's downfall. At that time, far from protecting innocence, Parliament was an instrument of tyranny. Receiving its spiritual jurisdiction from Henry VIII., it declared the Dioceses of Salisbury and Worcester vacant, because the bishops were foreigners, and spent the revenues of their sees out of England. This proceeding was analogous to that of dissolving marriage, and belonged only to the Pope, if, indeed, to him. Lastly, an Act of Succession, settling the Crown on the children of Anne, and making refusal to take it misprision of treason,² was passed. In

¹ *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, i., 150.

² “*Misprision of treason* is the concealment, or not disclosing of known treason; for the which the offenders are to suffer im-

reality, it was an Oath of Supremacy, and as such, opposed to the faith of Catholics. Henry's troubled conscience required the formal assent of his subjects, for the oath was administered to all persons of full age, a cruel alternative by which men consented to deadly sin, or to be ruined. The history of the Royal Supremacy, born in 1530 at Cromwell's suggestion, offers three distinct acts. First, in 1531, it was proposed to the clergy in Convocation, and rejected through the clause, "as far as the law of Christ will admit". Secondly, in the spring of 1534, when the so-called marriage with Anne Boleyn had taken place, Parliament transferred the Pope's power to the king. Lastly, after the Act of Succession had done its work, or rather, worked destruction both spiritually and materially, Henry's supremacy was enacted by the November session of the same year. The statute begins by declaring that the "king's majesty justly and rightly is, and ought to be, supreme head of the Church of England, and is so recognised by the clergy of this realm in their convocations". It proceeds: "Be it enacted, by the authority of this present Parliament, that the king, our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed, the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called '*Anglicana Ecclesia*,' and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to prisonment during the king's pleasure, lose their goods and the profits of their lands during their lives."—JOHNSON.

the imperial Crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the said Church belonging and appertaining. And that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought to be, or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity and tranquillity of this realm, any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any thing or things to the contrary thereof, notwithstanding.”¹

Parliament thus severed the union which had existed for 1000 years between the head of the Church and the head of the State, and simply “transubstantiated the sovereign into the Pope”. It was a revolution, and no revolution can take place without marking its passage. In England it produced tyranny and abject servility between king and subject: suffering and blood-shedding as the lot of the noblest and the best.

¹ Collier, iv., p. 251.

CHAPTER III.

THE DESTROYER OF THE FAITH.—A.D. 1534-1547.

THE Act of Succession was passed in Parliament, and received the royal assent on 30th March, 1534. All the king's subjects of full age were to bind themselves to the oath which it entailed, though no formula had been prescribed by Parliament. It was, in fact, Henry's manner of imposing his spiritual supremacy on the country at large, and it is therefore more properly called the Oath of *Supremacy*. Catholics might have sworn to a simple Act of Succession, settling the Crown on the children of Anne Boleyn, but they could not recognise the invalidity of Henry's marriage with Katherine after the Sovereign Pontiff had formally pronounced it valid. This was Sir Thomas More's view of the case. The succession, so he argued, might be settled by legislation, but Parliament could not dissolve what God had joined together, and Clement had just declared Henry and Katherine so joined.

On the rising of Parliament, in April, commissioners were at once appointed to require the Oath of Succession throughout the length and breadth of England. At these moments of crisis the tares and

the wheat are easily recognised, but at all times the call to martyrdom is obeyed only by a very small minority. Whilst the multitude took the oath in order to avoid the penalty of treason, possibly in some cases as a matter of form, the personal worth of those who declined it, made them strong as an army "stretched in battle array".

The full rigour of the new statute fell first and foremost on the Bishop of Rochester, and the ex-chancellor, Sir Thomas More. It will be seen that those who refused the oath received the punishment of traitors when it suited the king's pleasure.

The summons found Sir Thomas More ready. He took boat at Chelsea for Lambeth, where the commissioners were sitting. He had bidden farewell for ever to his home, and he seems to have known it, for suddenly, says Roper, who accompanied his father-in-law, he exclaimed : "Son Roper, I thank our Lord the field is won" ¹.

The Oath of Supremacy was at once his battle-field and his crown. He appeared before the commissioners, Cranmer, Audley, Cromwell, and the Abbot of Westminster, on 13th April, 1534, and having weighed the oath in the balance of his judicial and most Catholic mind, he firmly refused it. A few days later he was lodged in the Tower, in which place was "my Lord of Rochester" for the same offence. Cranmer exerted himself with Henry in their favour. He represented their willingness

¹ *Life of Blessed Thomas More*, 351.

to be sworn to the Act of Succession without the preamble. The cause of their refusal they would by no means express ; “ it must needs be the diminution of the authority of the Bishop of Rome, or else the reprobation of the king’s pretended matrimony ”.¹ Henry required examples, and none served his purpose better than the two men, whom nature and grace pointed out as foremost in his kingdom. The holiness of Fisher made him pre-eminent in the Church, whilst the wisdom, learning, and absolute integrity of Sir Thomas More, who had been lord chancellor, made him a marked man in the State. They were lodged respectively in the Beauchamp and the Bell Tower, and in grim solitude more than a year rolled away. The glimpses which the prisoners give us of their prison life are strangely pathetic. Blessed Thomas is as cheerful as in his Chelsea home. It seems to him that God “ dandleth him ” in giving him a prison cell in which he may taste the joys of uninterrupted prayer. Margaret Roper was with her father on the 4th of May, 1535. Together they watched the Carthusian Priors and their companions, going to death for refusal to take the oath. “ It was,” said Sir Thomas, “ as if those ‘ blessed fathers ’ were bridegrooms going to their marriage.”²

The Bishop of Rochester was no less engaged in

¹ Cranmer to Cromwell, quoted by Fr. Bridgett, *Life of Blessed Thomas More*, p. 358.

² Fr. Bridgett, *Life of Blessed Thomas More*, p. 404.

spiritual exercises, but he was a much older man, broken and infirm. In December, 1534, he petitioned Cromwell for some warm clothing and better food, and for a ghostly father, who might give him heavenly comfort at Christmas time. His pathetic appeal was disregarded, nor is it recorded that either received at any time during his captivity the support of a priest. The only exception to this was confession before execution.¹ Cranmer was the confessor assigned to Blessed John Fisher, and it may be surmised, though it is not stated, that Sir Thomas More enjoyed the privilege of confession at the last. Recourse was had to falsehood and deception, in order to break the constancy of those tried men. Each was told that his friend had given in and taken the oath, and each answered that he would persevere in refusing it were he the only man in the kingdom. The king, goaded on by Anne Boleyn, would wait no longer for the most generous blood in England.

The end came, first for the holy bishop. Early on St. Alban's Day, 22nd June, 1535, he was roused from his slumbers by the intelligence that he was to suffer at nine o'clock. He begged to be allowed to sleep a little longer, and on rising, looked for the "comfortable" passage of Scripture, which in default of all else was to serve him as Viaticum. His physical weakness was overcome in the glory of dying for the Catholic faith, for that, as he told the people

¹ Fr. Bridgett, *Life of Blessed Thomas More*, p. 368.

gathered round the block, was his privilege. Henry was informed of Paul III.'s intention of conferring the cardinal's hat on Fisher, and he brutally exclaimed that it should not find a head. He allowed the bishop's remains to be treated with an ignominy shared by the cause for which he died.

A few days later, Sir Thomas More, pale and weak from his long captivity, was led before his judges to go through a mock trial. Why, he was asked, could he not do what every man in England had done. He replied that he would not accuse the conscience of any man, but that he would not put himself against the whole of Christendom: the spiritual supremacy of a king was against the conscience of Christendom. He was pronounced guilty of high treason and of its penalty, which was afterwards commuted for beheading. When Sir Thomas heard of Henry's clemency, he said merrily: "Then, God preserve my friends from any more of the king's favours". He laid his head joyfully on the block, taking care to remove the beard which had done "no treason" (6th July, 1535). His devoted Meg provided for her father's burial in the Tower, and reclaimed his head from London Bridge, where, according to custom, it was exposed. She ordered that it was to be buried in her own coffin, and this trophy of our great martyr is at present in the Roper vault of St. Dunstan's Church, Canterbury. Although both Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More were buried in the Tower by the care of

Margaret Roper, there is reason to doubt whether their bodies are still resting in the Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula.

On the 4th of May, 1535, whilst Fisher and More were still prisoners, other witnesses for the Holy See preceded them by a more rapid way into the kingdom of heaven. They were three Carthusian priors, Richard Reynolds, a Bridgettine monk, and one secular priest, John Haile (or Hale). Amongst all religious orders at that time, the Carthusians and Franciscans of the Observance were the most renowned for their religious spirit. The history of the London Charterhouse of the Salutation of Our Lady exhibits an order in its first fervour. The Oath of Supremacy had been administered in the previous year, and the prior, John Houghton, after refusal and temporary imprisonment in the Tower, had listened to mistaken counsels, which he had sought in humble distrust of himself. On condition of swearing to the oath, he and his companion, Fr. Middlemore, were allowed to return to the Charterhouse. All the community took the oath “so far as it was lawful,” in May, 1534.¹ The clause, which was proved to be no idle word, invalidated the oath. The Carthusians never acknowledged the king’s supremacy, and suffered every sort of persecution from Cromwell in consequence. Whilst Cromwell and his crew raged outside, a heavenly peace reigned inside the Charterhouse. In the spring of 1535 the

¹ Fr. Gasquet, *Henry VIII.*, etc., i., p. 210.

priors of Axholme and Beauvale were visiting their brethren in London. The three priors went together to Cromwell, and besought him not to force their consciences in the matter of the oath. Cromwell's answer was a summons to death. Of the forty-eight monks who composed the London Charterhouse, sixteen are amongst our beatified martyrs. Six suffered the death of high treason on the 4th of May and 19th of June, 1535. The remaining ten, after enduring every sort of vexation from Cromwell's interference, an unfaithful prior and false brethren, were sent to Newgate in 1537, and there "despatched by the hand of God," a phrase which, being interpreted, signified a captivity worse than death. Brother William Horne survived the horrors of Newgate, and lingered in prison till 1540, when he was hanged at Tyburn. The Carthusian martyrs for the Holy See thus number eighteen.

The Franciscan Observant Friars shared the same heroism. They possessed at that time six convents in England, and had been introduced into this country by Henry VII.¹ Greenwich Palace adjoined their convent, and from the first they were devoted supporters of Queen Katherine. In her cause they braved that royal anger which is death, and when Cromwell threatened Fr. Peyto and Fr. Elstow to throw them into the Thames for their obstinacy they told him to keep his threats for those who

¹ *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, i., 156. Busch, *England unter den Tudors*.

regarded earthly things. The road to heaven was as short by water as by land. It was not Cromwell's policy to despatch men by a "short road" to heaven. Two hundred Observants were cast into foul dungeons, there to await "the visitation of God". Fifty succumbed to the horrors of imprisonment, whilst the others were banished or sent to convents of Conventuals. Their religious homes, in which they had led lives so mortified that no suffering daunted them, were suppressed in 1534. It was their glorious privilege not only to suffer all manner of persecution for the name of Jesus, but also to receive the first blows which were aimed at religious orders. Fr. Brockby lay for twenty-five days on a bed of agony in consequence of excessive racking. At length a jailer came to strangle him by the cord of his habit, 1537. Fr. Forest was condemned to be slowly burnt alive, after several years of confessorship in the dungeons of Henry VIII. He had been Queen Katherine's confessor in the Greenwich days, and they mutually encouraged each other when, as it was thought, he would be called first to his crown. He was allowed to linger for more than two years after the queen, and suffered his cruel death at Smithfield on 22nd May, 1538.

The secular clergy as a body could not then face the penalties of not taking the oath. They supplied only five witnesses to the chosen band, who preferred death to deadly sin: John Hale, Thomas Abel, Edward Powell, Richard Fetherstone and John

Larke, Vicar of Chelsea and parish priest of Sir Thomas More. Germain Gardiner, a cousin of Stephen Gardiner, moved by the example of Bishop Fisher and of More, laid down his life some years later; Sir Adrian Fortescue and Sir Thomas Dingley in 1539. Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, a princess of the royal blood, suffered in the same cause 1541. Their deaths do not belong to the early career of the Destroyer which may be said to have set in with the spring session of 1534. Every year was marked by so much blood-shedding that it is difficult not to turn with loathing from the spectacle of England cringing to so great a tyrant. In the year 1535 Henry had sacrificed the two greatest men in his kingdom, and given its holiest the martyr's crown. The death-roll of 1536 was quite as heavy. In its opening month Queen Katherine breathed her last, devout, patient, meek and firm as she had lived. It is supposed that the "hand of God" did not act promptly enough for Henry and Anne, and that they hastened the end for which they so greatly longed. The evidence of the chandler who embalmed Katherine's body at Kimbolton, where she died, would seem to prove that she might have succumbed to poison, which is said to have been twice administered. Henry's attitude certainly strengthens the suspicion. He would hardly have been kinder to Katherine than Henry II. was to St. Thomas of Canterbury:¹ the riddance was hailed with equal

¹ This is Friedmann's conclusion. *Anne Boleyn*, v., ii.

joy. With great inconsistency Henry was vexed with Anne for flaunting a yellow gown, yet appeared himself "clad in yellow, from top to toe".¹ The cheerless death of his faithful queen caused him no pang either of sorrow or remorse. Whether or not he or Anne hastened the hour which is in God's keeping, he poured gall and bitterness on Katherine's last days by refusing her the sight of her child. Katherine, Queen of England, was dead. Anne might have envied her peace and the resignation to God's will which sweetened all her sorrows. Anne's crown, the object of her ambition, had not brought her happiness. Scarcely had Cranmer declared her marriage valid than Henry began to tire of her. The birth of Princess Elizabeth in September, 1533, was a grievous disappointment for the king, and he had arrived at that stage of tyranny which will not brook disappointment. Anne, who had failed to present him with a Prince of Wales, no longer interested him. From ceasing to care for her, he grew to dislike her, so that her life became a perpetual strain. She was losing her hold upon the king, and during the course of 1535 looked upon herself as a "ruined woman". Then came Katherine's death, her burst of hysterical joy at being "truly a queen," and her hopes of giving Henry an heir, frustrated for ever by Jane Seymour. The career of "the principal cause and wet nurse of heresy"² was typical. For Anne the breach with

¹ *National Biography*, "Henry VIII."

² Words used of her by Chapuys, the imperial ambassador.

Rome was consummated, and England was cut off from the rest of Christendom. For her sake the best blood of England was spent, and the destruction involved in Henry's fall from the Catholic faith and unity was set in motion. It is even now at work. Anne gained three years of doubtful prosperity, certainly not happiness, and died by the executioner's hand simply to make way for a rival. Her trial and execution was a superfluous act of cruelty, whatever her guilt. The king had only to annul his marriage with her, which he could have done for the best of reasons, since its nullity from the beginning was perfectly well known to himself. Anne was assisted in her last hours by Cranmer, who, being himself excommunicated, could only deal with those *in articulo mortis*. Both the wretched woman and the Archbishop had bartered the Catholic faith when they transferred their allegiance from the Pope to the king. Both were heretics, Anne perhaps in a lesser degree, as it is recorded that she petitioned to have the Blessed Sacrament left in her room so that she might pray to her "Maker". Cranmer had given up both Transubstantiation and the Priesthood, but in reality what makes a heretic is the wilful renouncement of a single article of faith. In this point of view the one was as little a Catholic as the other. Henry was spending the 19th of May with Jane Seymour. The firing of cannon apprised him of Anne's execution. He supped gaily with Jane, and married her the following day, 20th May, 1536.

The woman for whose sake he had become supreme head was quickly interred in St. Peter's Chapel, without, it would seem, any religious ceremony, whilst the work of destruction she had entailed went on apace.

The first suppressions of monastic houses were actually carried out in 1536, but they had been in preparation since the passing of the Oath of Succession. Cromwell became the king's vicar-general for the business, a title which gave him precedence over every lord, spiritual and temporal.¹ The office was created for him and dropped with him. It was an anomaly, but he had created a greater, for if the king was to become head of the Church a lay vicar-general was by no means beside the mark. Commissioners proceeded to administer the oath to religious houses, and as Parliament had prescribed no "formula" it was left to the discretion of Cromwell's visitors and made much more stringent. The man who pleaded scruples of conscience in order to repudiate his true wife, succeeded in imposing his version of these dissolutions on posterity, *i.e.*, the Supreme Head, fired with zeal for God's glory, abolished those religious establishments which were as whitened sepulchres, fair to behold, all corruption within. The truth is, the religious houses were strongholds of the Pope's authority, and as such would have fostered defiance, direct and indirect, of the Royal Supremacy. Cromwell, the omnipotent

¹ Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii., 784.

vicar-general, could not allow them to stand, and under the new act they were practically swept away. The second reason was more material. The king's greed was tempted by their revenues and valuables, and the king's men would have their share of the booty.¹

The act was startling enough to take the country by surprise, nor can it be a matter of wonder that many monks and nuns did not perceive what the king's real object was in ordering a general visitation. The recorded adhesions of religious houses to the Oath of Supremacy, whether forced or spontaneous, do not amount to more than 105.² We know to-day that the religious themselves were to be expulsed at any price, no matter what they were, nor what they were doing. Cromwell's inquisitors were furnished with eighty-six articles of inquiry, and with instructions to require the dismissal of all religious under twenty-four years of age, and of those who had been professed under twenty. In September, 1535, Henry notified to Cranmer that all episcopal authority was to be suspended whilst Cromwell and his commissioners were at work on the monasteries. Servile as they were, the bishops did not relish these orders. The king, Cromwell, and his visitors, chiefly Dr. Layton, Dr. London, Legh, Bedyll and Ap. Rice, constituted the practical

¹ Fr. Gasquet, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, i., 247.

² *Ibid.*, i., 248.

hierarchy of England till the opening of the spring session in 1536. This Parliament had sat since 1529, and now it was to close with the dissolution of monasteries. It had no will of its own, therefore Henry's pleasure prevailed. The men charged with these weighty investigations into convent life and morals were far from immaculate, and they were open to bribery and corruption in no ordinary degree. They created the myth of the "Black Book," which still exists, and is popularly supposed to be a black report of monks and nuns, drawn up by protesting Christians. The fact is, these men used intimidation, threats, anything to achieve their purpose,¹ but they brought no facts to justify the suppression of religious houses. The king wished it, and that was enough for their servile minds. How much the king wished it may be gathered from his attitude to the Commons during the passing of the bill. "It stuck long in the Lower House," says Spelman, who was almost a contemporary (he was born in 1562). The king commanded the Commons to attend upon him. After keeping them waiting several hours, he came out casting angry looks on every side.

"I hear," saith he, "that my bill will not pass, but I will have it pass, or I will have some of your heads!"²

The "heads" that would have opposed him had already fallen by the executioner's axe, and Henry

¹ *Henry VIII.*, etc., i., 289.

² *Ibid.*, i., 312.

knew it. Moreover, he reduced the living to silence by ordering those from whom resistance was to be expected to stay away. The dissolution of the lesser monasteries with revenues not exceeding £200 a year was the last business transacted by a Parliament which had abjectly done Henry's bidding and revolutionised the country. About 376 houses fell under the act, representing a revenue of £32,000. The Court of Augmentation was founded to receive and to distribute the various moneys accruing from the suppressions. The chancellor of this court touched an income of some £7500 a year in our present value. The religious houses were stripped of everything which could be turned to money, even down to their scanty articles of furniture. In certain cases pensions were granted, though never to the young, and during Henry's reign at least they were fairly well paid. In the suppression of the lesser monasteries, superiors alone were pensioned, that is, of 2000 religious only 204. Fifty-two houses were refounded by Henry for the bribe of £5948=£60,000 of our present value. They thus purchased leave to prolong a painful existence for a few years. With the exception of about eighteen houses, the convents of nuns fell under this Act of Suppression. Nuns in England numbered about 1560 in 140 houses.¹ A very small number were pensioned, and, indeed, viewed aright, a pension was an indignity, for later on it was made the price of

¹ *Henry VIII.*, etc., ii., 237.

surrender. The religious who offered resistance to the king's commands had no chance of a pension. The Abbess of Syon received £200 a year, which was quite an exceptional sum, for her compliance. The rule was to cast the nuns adrift, with such apparel as "secular women wear," with the obligations of religion and none of its securities. For the majority it was like returning from the dead, their homes and places were gone, and want stared them in the face.

Cromwell's commissioners visited the condemned houses, produced the Act of Suppression, and proceeded to take possession for the king. The process was summary. The king's commissioners broke the convent seal and paid any pension which had been granted to abbot or monks. The silver plate, altar vessels, and all valuables were put aside for the king, whilst household goods and stuff were sold, and the price paid to the Court of Augmentation. The abbot's quarters were allowed to stand for the next owner. Lead from the church, monastery, or cells, was torn off, as well as anything else which could be converted into money, and the monastic pile was left to ruin and decay. The monastery lands were either given away or sold.¹ This destruction was not easily accomplished. The king was informed by a commissioner that the cost of demolishing in Lincolnshire would be £1000.²

¹ Spillmann, *Die Englischen Martyrer*, p. 128.

² *Calendar of State Papers*, edited by Gairdner; Preface, xi., xiii.

Faith had taken as deep a root in the soil as in the hearts of the people.

Three principal reasons as a rule made the religious houses conducive to the general weal. They employed a great number of people; they practised generous hospitality towards both rich and poor; they gave large alms as a duty of Christian charity, regularly, and without capriciousness. These, amongst other reasons, were pleaded for the maintenance of Carmarthen Priory,¹ a source of food and living water for the neighbourhood. It is estimated that about 10,000 persons were dependent for their livelihood on the monasteries, and shared the living death which was inflicted on the religious. Occupation, home consequently, was suddenly taken away.

On the first suppressions, when already the whole measure was in contemplation, it was derisive to offer the monks their freedom or retirement into “the great solemn monasteries”. Nothing was long “great or solemn” to Henry. Parliament gave him the lesser monasteries, or rather he wrested them from Parliament in his own way. The same Parliament at another time had made an important change in English law. Estates tail were rendered forfeitable for treason. Thus, when abbots or heads of houses were attainted, their houses fell to the Crown. The greater monasteries were dissolved by attainder or surrender. To make assur-

¹ *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, ii., p. 31.

ance doubly sure Parliament provided, indirectly, for the emergency or eventuality. An act of April, 1539, covered the illegal suppressions of the greater monasteries, granting to the king all monasteries "which shall hereafter happen to be dissolved, suppressed, renounced, relinquished, forfeited, given up, or come into the king's highness".¹ Between 1538 and 1540, 202 houses were thus suppressed. The proportion of pensioners was exactly the same as with the lesser monasteries. Of the 8000 religious thus cast adrift, under 4000 received pensions. In large monasteries, £100 would be given to superiors when compliant, and £5 or £6 to each religious on the same conditions. The commoner fate was a priest's gown and forty shillings; the commonest of all, no provision whatever.²

The legal dissolution, if we may so call it, was a less trial than surrender, which meant that religious life under Crown surveillance was made almost too intolerable to be endured.

After the monks came the turn of the friars. The friaries in England numbered 200 in 1538, divided between Franciscans, Dominicans, Austins, Carmelites, Trinitarians, and a few others less well known. The houses of the Franciscan Observants had been suppressed as a special favour in 1534, for their fearless devotedness at once to the Holy See and

¹ Fr. Gasquet, ii., p. 340.

² *Ibid.*, i., p. 276; ii., 459, and Chapter on Pensions to Religious.

to Queen Katherine, and Dr. Geo. Brown, an Augustinian, nominated general of mendicants. The friaries were very poor and not worth suppressing from a pecuniary point of view. The king profited, however, largely by the sale of their sites and buildings.¹ Only one or two friars were pensioned, and the rest were turned adrift with five shillings and their "capacities" (faculties), when they were fortunate enough to get them. It is evident that the needs of souls were far surpassed by the needs of pastors.

The three great Benedictine Abbeys of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester were confiscated by the attainder of their respective abbots. Cromwell's cold-blooded note has often been quoted: " *Item, The Abbot of Glaston to be tried at Glaston, and also executed there* ".²

The Venerable Richard Whiting, Abbot of Glastonbury, had taken the Oath of Supremacy according to the letter, but not according to the spirit. He never renounced his allegiance to the Pope, and would not surrender his abbey to those who had. The same may be said of Abbot Cook, of Reading, and of Abbot Marshall, also called Beeche, of Colchester. Probably they had both taken the oath through a misconception of its significance, not through even a slight faltering in their fidelity to the Holy See. They declined to surrender, which was no disobedience to the law of the land. Parliament had given

¹ Fr. Gasquet, ii., p. 273.

² *Henry VIII.*, etc., p. 349.

the king only the lesser monasteries, and provided by a clause for future eventualities. The three mitred abbots were attainted of high treason, drawn, hanged and quartered, and their rich abbeys passed into the king's hands, 1539.

The Abbot of Woburn, Hobbes, had preceded them into eternity. He had taken the Oath of Supremacy, and had fallen ill with remorse. As he lay in bed, sick and sorrowful, he exclaimed in anguish : "Oh that I had died with those holy men who suffered death because they were true to the Pope ! My conscience torments me for my fall." The words were betrayed. The sick abbot was hurried off to London, and suffered death for the Holy See, together with his prior, and the Vicar of Puddington, in 1537.¹ Those were days when men died of broken hearts, so bitter was the "struggle between the king as their conscience and their conscience as their king".²

The people's answer to the monastic suppressions was not slow in coming. Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, at least, did not contemplate the pillaging of their religious houses without uttering a vigorous protest. These counties were particularly rich in convents. Yorkshire possessed as many as forty-seven houses of men and twenty-seven of nuns, whose sudden removal was equivalent to what a general closing of banks, hotels and law-courts would

¹ Spillmann, 123.

² Brewer, *Calendar of State Papers*, edited by Gairdner, p. 85.

be now. Money transactions of a confidential character, the duties of hospitality and of justice were carried out by the religious, whilst nuns trained the mass of gentle Englishwomen. The Lincolnshire or Northern Rising originated at Louth, upon the suppression of Louth Park Monastery in September, 1536. The people thought, rightly or wrongly, that their parish churches would be plundered and desecrated, and they rose in a body to protest against the royal nominations to bishoprics, the royal counsellors, the suppressions and the consequences of the spiritual supremacy. They looked upon the payment of first fruits and tenths to the king as a great grievance. The Archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, the Bishops of Rochester, St. David's and others, they considered subverters of the Christian religion, and they hated Cromwell, who had been drawn from the ranks to destroy all that they held dear. His position as lay vicar-general of the king's spiritual headship had no parallel. To their spiritual wrongs they added a just indignation at the Statute of Uses, by which Henry had sought to restrict the liberty of testators, and even to abolish wills. The Northern Rising exemplifies the state of feeling not in Lincolnshire only, but in England generally, although the counties richest in religious houses were more specially disaffected.

The insurgents had very real grievances, and laid down their lives for giving expression to them. Of

the 100 tried for taking part in the first Northern Rising, fifty were put to death, including the Abbot of Kirksted, the Abbot of Barling, some priests, monks and laymen.

The country was not yet reduced to silence. Terror had not spoken loud enough to check the Pilgrimage of Grace. By October, 1536, the North of England, from the Scotch border to the Humber, was in a state of insurrection. Yorkshire remained the headquarters of the Pilgrimage, and raised aloft the banners of the crucifix, the chalice and the Sacred Host, emblems of the faith which inspired it. Sixty thousand men were no mean host. They counted amongst them Lords Neville, Darcy, Lumley and Latimer, most of the northern nobility, Sir Robert Constable and the Archbishop of York. Had the pilgrims marched to London they might have carried the day, and insisted on Henry's fidelity to his coronation oath. They committed the error of trusting the king, and opening negotiations at Doncaster with his representative, the Duke of Norfolk. Robert Aske, the commander-in-chief of the insurgents, treated the king with loyalty and sincerity, and perished as a traitor for his pains. Henry had not the slightest intention of dealing fairly by the pilgrims, yet he held out false hopes to Robert Aske, whilst he instructed the Duke of Norfolk to answer the insurgents by martial law. Out of twenty-four petitions, which they laid before the king, three may be quoted :—

1. “That the suppressed abbeys be reinstated with their former houses, lands and estates.”

2. “We most humbly ask our sovereign lord and king that he would declare the Lady Mary legitimate, and repeal the former statute.”

3. “That the title, ‘Supreme Head,’ so far as it implies *cura animarum*, should be reserved for the Roman See, as it always used to be, and that bishops should receive their orders from the same.”¹

The sovereign lord had only one answer: the movement was to be stamped out by the rigours of martial law. Wholesale executions, brought prominently before the eyes and mind of all, struck terror into those strong hearts. In Westmoreland and Cumberland alone seventy-four persons were summarily hanged. Sixteen of the foremost Yorkshire ringleaders were lodged in the Tower, pending their execution. Amongst them were the Abbots of Fountains and Jervaulx, Sir John Bulmer, Sir Robert Constable, and the aged Lord Darcy. Lady Bulmer, the wife of a ringleader, was burnt at Smithfield, and Robert Aske, betrayed by the king, was hanged at York² (1537).

These risings express clearly what the monastic suppressions were to the people. The three mitred abbots with their four Benedictine followers were the martyrs of the dissolutions, to which the Oath of Supremacy ostensibly led. But Henry was not satisfied with the plunder offered even by the richest

¹ *Henry VIII.*, etc., ii., p. 82.

² Spillmann, 120-122.

monasteries. He believed in the communion and invocation of saints as much as in the obligation of religious vows, yet he destroyed the faith of England with regard to all these points. He had made the practice of religious life impossible, and he struck a deadly blow at devotion to our Lady and the saints by plundering every time-honoured shrine in England which had valuables. Our Lady and the saints were cast out of national life, together with the monks and nuns. Walsingham Priory was suppressed in 1536, and its site sold to Thomas Sydney. The famous statue was brought to London and burnt, together with the image of our Lady of Ipswich. Latimer, who had been made Bishop of Worcester through the influence of Anne Boleyn and of Cromwell, invited Cromwell (1538) to burn the statue of our Lady of Worcester.¹ In one sense Latimer was less guilty than Henry, for he had lost the faith. The tower of ivory was gone, therefore he called the Mass "a foul abomination".²

The body of St. Cuthbert was removed and reburied, and his splendid shrine was appropriated by the "royal wreckers". No treasure escaped Henry. The actual cash value of the suppressions to the king's purse was from 14,000,000 to 15,000,000.³ To this must be added the gold and silver spoils, vestments, and countless precious stones and jewels, which the days of faith had accumulated in England

¹ Fr. Bridgett, *Our Lady's Dowry*, p. 307.

² Latimer's *Works*, i., 237. ³ *Henry VIII.*, etc., ii., p. 438.

round the Body of our Lord, or the shrines of His Mother and the saints.

There is a certain similarity between the outward fortunes of Wolsey and Cromwell. Each exercised a power hitherto unknown in English history, and enjoyed Henry's unbounded favour, for which the country hated whilst it feared them. *Oderint dum metuant.* Anne Boleyn had overthrown Wolsey, and another Anne was to be the ruin of Cromwell. In 1539 Henry had been a widower for more than two years, though apparently not a broken-hearted one. Just after Jane Seymour's death he had made overtures of marriage to Marie of Lorraine.¹ She preferred King James of Scotland, and Henry finally accepted, at Cromwell's suggestion, Anne, sister of the Duke of Cleves. The bride-elect arrived in England in January, 1540, but her presence diminished the fame of her beauty. She was without grace or charm, and found only disfavour in Henry's eyes. He was very unwillingly induced to marry her, and bore the yoke of his fourth matrimony for a few months. Cromwell in the meantime had reached that point of prosperity which, under Henry VIII., betokened a fall. He had received thirty manors of suppressed religious houses, and had been created lord chamberlain, lord privy seal, and Earl of Essex. He had been the instrument of Henry's vengeance on the Poles. Reginald's head was beyond Henry's power when, in 1536, he received the cardinal's hat. He had left

¹ Lingard, *History of England*, vi., p. 298.

England, and safe in his retreat he addressed fearless words to Henry which, it is to be surmised, were visited upon his relations. Anne Boleyn's fall, then the Northern Risings had stirred up hopes in the Cardinal's mind, which were never to be realised in Henry's lifetime. Lord Montague, Reginald's eldest brother, was involved in the Exeter plot, and beheaded with the Marquess of Exeter for high treason in December, 1538. A few months later, 1539, Cromwell brought before Parliament a Bill of Attainder against the Marchioness of Exeter and the Countess of Salisbury. Lady Exeter was respited, but the Countess was allowed to linger for two years in the Tower with the sword hanging over her head. She thus survived the great enemy of her family.

In April, 1540, Cromwell took his usual place in the House of Lords at the opening of Parliament, and expounded the royal *via media* in religion. The king, he said, wished to steer clear of superstition on the one hand, and of Lutheranism on the other. The vicar-general himself was already under suspicion of heresy for protecting a certain Dr. Barnes, who preached justification by faith only, in defiance of the royal authority. The king dissembled in order to strike the more surely. Barnes and Anne of Cleves were sufficient grievances against a minister whom Henry had determined to overthrow. To these was added the charge of high treason, and Cromwell was hurried away to death with the promptitude he had so terribly dealt out to others. The Bill of Attainder,

which was his own contrivance, was turned against himself. He pleaded abjectly for his life; but Henry had no mercy on his victim, and ordered him out to slaughter. The reign of Anne of Cleves and of Cromwell ended almost simultaneously. A public execution is often seen to be a grace of God. Apparently it enabled Cromwell to make a good act of contrition. He had been a sinner from his youth upwards, he said on the scaffold, yet he had never doubted the Catholic faith, nor a single Catholic sacrament. Whether he had "benefit of clergy" does not appear. Unfortunately Cromwell could not add satisfaction to his contrition. He had made the king Pope, and so had indeed grievously sinned against him, but he had transferred the spiritual allegiance of a whole kingdom from St. Peter's See to the British sovereign, and the consequences of his act will be as abiding as the Anglican heresy itself.

Cromwell's head fell in June, 1540, and in the following month the king, being supreme head, proceeded through Parliament to divorce Anne of Cleves. No dissentient voice was raised, and shortly afterwards Henry was invited to enter upon a fifth marriage for the good of the kingdom. The Duke of Norfolk was not afraid of providing a second niece as queen, and Katherine Howard's short reign began (August, 1540).

The Six Articles, issued in 1539, may be regarded as Henry's profession of faith. He was determined to prove his orthodoxy, and Parliament was, as ever,

called in to sanction his pleasure, even when that pleasure took the form of drawing up articles of faith, which he tried to enforce by corporeal punishment. These articles were : First, the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Second, Communion under both kinds not necessary for salvation. Third, the celibacy of priests commanded by the law of God. Fourth, obligation of vows of chastity. Fifth, private Masses should be retained. Sixth, auricular confession necessary and expedient. It was death to write, preach or dispute against Transubstantiation. Active opposition to any of the other five incurred the penalties of felony; the holding or publishing contrary opinions was punishable by imprisonment for the first offence with forfeiture of goods; for the second offence with death. The marriages of priests and nuns were illegal, and if persisted in carried with them the pain of felony. Persons refusing to receive the Sacraments at Easter were to be fined and imprisoned for the first offence, and for the second to suffer the penalty of felony.¹

Three of these articles call for special attention. Henry's strong belief in Transubstantiation is often quoted in his favour, as if it alone were proof positive of his Catholic faith. It is not devotion to a particular dogma that constitutes a Catholic, but a deep and sincere acceptance of the authority on which all Catholic belief rests. This basis of authority Henry had transferred to himself in defiance of law,

¹ Lingard, vi., 293.

human or divine. The chief personage in his hierarchy, Cranmer, had contracted a second and secret marriage in Germany, and his example, for it was an open secret, had imitators amongst the bishops, who thus acted not only against the Catholic canon, but against Henry's canon. In the same way, the fourth article belonged to the paper religion inaugurated by the Tudors. How insist upon the obligations of chastity when religious life in England was made an impossibility? A legislation resting on adultery cannot stand.

In July, 1540, a novel spectacle was witnessed. Three Catholics, who are now among our beatified martyrs, Thomas Abel, Edward Powell, and Richard Fetherstone, secular priests, and three Protestants, Barnes, Garret, and Jerome, were drawn on the same hurdles to execution.¹ The three first suffered the death of high treason for denying the king's supremacy; the Protestants were burnt for holding heterodox opinions. *Martyrem non facit pœna sed causa.*²

Cromwell was gone, yet if the English reign of terror was somewhat relaxed in consequence, there was no corresponding change in Henry's conduct. Cromwell's Bill of Attainder against the Countess of Salisbury had not yet been carried out. The last of the Plantagenets still lingered in the Tower, guilty of no crime except her attachment to the Catholic faith, and of being Cardinal Pole's mother.

¹ Lingard, vi., 309.

² St. Augustine.

On the 27th May, 1541, the aged Princess was led out to the scaffold on Tower Green, and told that she was at last to die on a charge of high treason. When called upon to lay her head on the block, she replied : " So may traitors do : I am no traitor. If you want my head you must take it as you best can." She was held down by main force to receive the death stroke, and in that solemn moment uttered the words of our Lord : " Blessed are they who suffer persecution for justice sake ". Margaret Plantagenet gave her royal blood for the Catholic religion and is added to the glorious band of our beatified martyrs.

In February of the following year, 1542, Henry's fifth queen laid her head on the block. Katherine Howard suffered death on a charge of infidelity before her marriage. It may be that evil tongues magnified her youthful indiscretions. There was certainly no need to bring them forward, and those who did so must have been actuated either by self-interest, or the exaggerated king-worship of the period. The unfortunate queen was hurried out of life, as so many others had been before her. She spent her last days at Sion, giving an example of humility, contrition and meekness. It would have been happier for her not to have worn a crown, but it is probable she had not even the liberty of refusal. Lady Rochford, sister-in-law of Anne Boleyn, was executed with Katherine, and, says a bystander : " They made the most godly and christyan's end

that ever was hard tell of, I thinke, since the world's creation".¹

Henry was not contented with citing the living before his tribunal. By what St. Augustine might have called a *magnus passus extra viam*, that is, an insane application of the usurped spiritual keys, he instituted through his attorney-general a process against St. Thomas of Canterbury, 1538. "By these presents," ran the summons, "we call and invite you, Thomas, formerly Archbishop of Canterbury, to appear before our sovereign tribunal, that we may inquire into the causes of your death." A delay of thirty days was allowed to the saint whose very bones spoke loudly for the liberties of the Church. At the end of that time sentence was pronounced. It was sufficiently evident to all, it ran, that Thomas had been a disturber of the peace and an enemy of the royal power: that he had died for his offences, not for the honour of God and His Church: that sovereignty belonged to the kings of this realm, *not to the Bishop of Rome*, as he contended, to the prejudice of the Crown. He was looked upon as a martyr because, in the popular estimation, those who die in the defence of the Roman Church's authority are held in veneration.²

Since the great archbishop could not suffer death for the Holy See a second time, Henry inflicted summary execution on his body and on his memory. His name was erased from the books of the living

¹ Lingard, vi., 316.

² Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii., 835.

and his bones were burnt. Any one who should presume to pay the honours of the altar to St. Thomas was declared guilty of high treason, and the slightest fidelity to his memory was punishable by forfeiture of goods. No doubt Henry wished to single out St. Thomas Becket for special infamy, but it is equally certain that he was sorely tempted by the treasure of a shrine which for more than three centuries had received the offerings of Catholic hearts. The royal wreckers laid willing hands on the mass of valuables which, according to Pollini, could scarcely be conveyed away in twenty-six carts.¹ One stone with an angel of gold Henry had set in a ring, and wore it on his thumb.

In another particular Henry VIII. perpetuated the wrongs done by Henry II. The Plantagenet king had become "Lord of Ireland," and he had bequeathed the inheritance to his successors on the throne. In 1542 the Tudor Henry took the title of King of Ireland. He became king in more than the name, whereas the lordship had been a turbulent possession. Practically the country was given up to the rulings of petty chieftains. In Wolsey's day, however, two powerful families, the Fitzgeralds and the Butlers, greatly influenced the fortunes of Ireland. By appointing the Duke of Norfolk, then Earl of Surrey, deputy of the country, the prime minister remotely prepared the way for the event of 1542. Henry's sovereignty was full of woe for

¹ Wilkins, iii., 835.

Ireland, since he aspired to be supreme head of the Church in that country no less than in England. The anti-Catholic measures carried out in England by Henry and his vicar-general were passed on to Ireland. A Parliament was called in Dublin to consider the king's spiritual supremacy (1536), but it was a Parliament deprived of its principal element of resistance, the clergy or their proctors, who were not allowed legislative powers. Henry, therefore, was declared supreme head of the Church in Ireland, without the consent of the Church. The usual results followed the transfer of allegiance from the Holy See to the Crown. First fruits of all ecclesiastical livings were given to the king, and the religious houses, those strongholds of Papal authority, were suppressed. The erection of the new kingdom in 1542 opened the flood-gates of worldliness for the probation of the upper classes. Whilst bishops, priests, and people resisted the king's supremacy, chieftains and lords of the pale were fascinated by the king's gifts, and gave up their independence as Catholics and as Irishmen. The O'Briens became Earls of Thomond, and the O'Neills Earls of Tyrone. Dr. George Brown, the ex-Augustinian prior, who had been induced to marry Henry privately to Anne Boleyn, was rewarded for his services by the Archibiscopal See of Dublin (1536). He received consecration and the pallium from Cranmer, and was as perfect an Erastian as his consecrator himself. He could make no impression in Ireland, where, he said,

“the poorest little choir-boy” was more honoured than he.¹ Henry’s letter of remonstrance to his Archbishop throws a light upon Brown’s failure. The ex-Augustinian was not a man to lead others by personal influence, and the same may be said of all Henry’s agents in Ireland. His work of destruction was neutralised by their badness.

Bishop Staples of Meath, a sorry heretic, whom the people simply detested, was his second frustrator in the hierarchy. He bore much the same character as Brown, whom Henry himself reproved for “his lightness of behaviour, the elation of his mind in pride, and of all virtue and honesty being banished from him”.²

The third agent in the Anglican conversion of Ireland was Bale, an apostate Carmelite, who, for scurrility of language and probably of life, surpassed both Brown and Staples. He retained only a blind hatred of the holy mysteries which he had once loved. For him the centre of Catholic worship, the Mass, was “abominable and idolatrous”.³ Bale was intruded into the See of Ossory in 1552, took to himself a wife, for the prohibitive Six Articles were no longer in operation at that date, and made himself so obnoxious to the Irish that he was practically forced to return to England. He was not rewarded with an English see at Elizabeth’s accession, but died obscurely at Canterbury in 1563.

¹ Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Kirche in Irland*, ii., p. 62.

² Cardinal Moran, *History of the Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 35.

³ Bale’s *Works*, 171.

Bodkin was imposed upon Tuam, and enjoyed the revenues, whilst the rightful Archbishop, O'Farrell, was a wanderer and a beggar in his own diocese. The chieftains succumbed to worldliness and greed, for it is admitted that Henry lavished the monastic spoils in Ireland even more freely than in England. The O'Neill, at least, still had conscience enough to regret his subservience for the sake of plunder. In 1542 he sent a confidential messenger to Rome, in order to obtain absolution from the Holy Father.¹ Henry's efforts to pervert the faith of Ireland did not succeed. Later on Anglicanism gained a firmer footing, though it has never taken root in Irish soil. To educate a few Browns and foist them upon the people was a piteous apostolate, and to intoxicate a certain number of chieftains with wealth and honour was no great achievement. The best that Henry did for Ireland was to make some martyrs and to build the country up into a nation of confessors, yet bad as Henry's day was it was only the beginning of woes.

Scotland, in the person of James V., turned a deaf ear to the English king's proselytism. As early as 1535, Henry sent an ecclesiastic to the Scotch court, who was to represent to King James the blessings of the royal supremacy. The man so singled out by Henry was no other than Barlow, Bishop of St. David's, and the future consecrator of Matthew Parker. His claim to have been a "subverter of the Christian religion," as the northern

¹ Bellesheim, ii., 68, 94.

pilgrims asserted, can be very fairly made out. A churchman in name only, he disbelieved in Church, priesthood and Sacraments.¹ Barlow failed to obtain even a hearing from King James, who, far from disaffecting the Holy See, professed himself ready to join in carrying out the Pope's sentence of excommunication against Henry. The troubles of Scotland were to follow at no distant date (1560), but they did not radiate from a royal supremacy.

Henry now turned his attention once more to the Bible. At a former time he had authorised an English version, and allowed all his subjects free access to the holy book. But familiarity had bred contempt. The Bible thus delivered over to the popular mind without the safeguard of the living Church as its divinely-inspired interpreter, had produced division, heated controversy, and strife. In May, 1543, therefore, it was enacted that Tyndal's version should be disused, and that the authorised translation should be generally adopted. Furthermore, the public reading of the Bible was prohibited; it could be read in private only to lords and gentlemen, whilst only householders and ladies of noble or gentle birth might read it to themselves. Any other person presuming to open the Bible was liable to one month's imprisonment.² No legislation on Henry's part could stem the tide of "free thought," which being interpreted signifies freedom to doubt. It was however incumbent on him to give his

¹ Collier, iv., 388.

² Lingard, vi., 317.

subjects some spiritual food in place of the full Catholic banquet which he had taken away from them. He embodied the Six Articles in a book which for some time, and pending other human elucubrations, served as a standard of English orthodoxy. Henry's hand was veiled under learned committees and Convocation, and the efforts of three long years, during which his docile prelates and theologians were contented to sit hearing dogmatical questions and answering none. Finally in 1543 appeared "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any christened man," and it received the name of the *King's Book*. The Six Articles left many points of Christian doctrine in the background. Perhaps the *King's Book* supplied some of these deficiencies. Certain it is that purgatory was allowed for a time to remain in abeyance by the dogmatising monarch. Soon after the publication of his manual the king married his sixth and last wife, Katherine Parr, the widow of Lord Latimer, July, 1543. Judged by the standard of the Six Articles, she was his first Protestant queen, though some of her predecessors had fallen into the Anglican heresy. Katherine favoured all the new opinions, and made no secret of them till they nearly landed her in the Tower. She owed her life to her presence of mind, telling the king she had supposed a little discussion whiled away his hours of pain. "Then, sweetheart, we are friends again,"¹ he replied.

¹ Lingard, vi., 352.

Henry's last Parliament, called in 1545, put the finishing stroke to his destructions by dissolving all colleges, free chapels, chantries, hospitals, fraternities, and guilds, and placing their revenues at his disposal. The poor on earth and the dead were thus defrauded of their rights, whilst the interests of learning were practically surrendered by a servile legislation. The maintenance of stipendiary priests was also confiscated to the Crown. Henry wanted money, ostensibly for the expenses of his wars with France and Scotland, and the "mismanagement of governors" was now alleged with as much truth as the depravity of monks and nuns had been on a former occasion. The greed of Henry, who was ever a firm believer in purgatory, told against himself later on when the measure he had meted to others was heaped upon his own soul.

With his Protestant tone of thought Collier remarks: "As Popes have often taken money to let souls out of purgatory, so the king took land, one would almost think, to keep them in".

Another Act assured to the Crown seventy manors belonging to the Archbischopric of York. Cranmer, and Bonner, Bishop of London, had likewise conveyed certain manors of their sees to the Crown.¹ After giving their spiritual allegiance it is not to be supposed that they would hold back their lands. The statute once more emphasized the royal supremacy and declared that "archbishops, bishops,

¹ Collier, v., p. 149.

archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from his royal majesty. And that his majesty is the only undoubted supreme head of the Church of England and Ireland, to whom, by Holy Scripture, all authority and power is wholly given, to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, and to correct vice and sin whatsoever, and to all such persons as his majesty shall appoint thereunto.”¹

The supreme head expressed his gratitude to Parliament for the confidence which it reposed in him, and promised that “neither learning, the Church, nor the poor should receive any damage”. In the meantime the chantry priests, and the mismanaging governors of various degrees included by the Act, went to swell the ever-increasing ranks of the unemployed.

Henry was not blind to the godless state of things produced by his own conduct. In his last speech to Parliament, a month before his death, he bewailed with tears in his eyes the general want of brotherly love, the neglect and disrespect paid to the worship of God, and the dishonour of His holy word. In the lowest inns and taverns the Bible would be discussed and criticised, and its sacred pages treated with gross familiarity. Yes, because the king had taken away the tap-root of the Catholic religion. He had allowed Transubstantiation, the invocation of saints,

¹ Collier, v., p. 150.

religious vows, and the outward fabric of Catholic life to remain, at least in his paper ordinances, but he had undermined the basis on which all rested. He had plucked up the root of Catholic dogma, and then feigned to wonder that the seedless earth would not produce its fair fruits and flowers.

It seems probable that Henry expressed in his last days some wish for reconciliation with Rome. He consulted Bishop Gardiner on the subject, who gave him the wretched advice of laying his wish before Parliament, that Parliament which had sold its soul at Henry's bidding. Nothing was done. The consequences of the king's destructive action had passed out of his hands, and his tardy purpose of amendment, if purpose there were, would have been opposed by those who had grown rich on convent spoils.

Whether Henry died as he had lived, cheating conscience by hearing Mass and receiving Sacraments with mortal sin and excommunication upon his soul, or whether grim despair, graphically expressed in the words "All is lost," took possession of him, must remain conjecture. It is certain that he retained his butcher instincts to the last, that they were fatal to the Earl of Surrey, executed by attainder on 19th January, 1547, and that his faithful servant, the Duke of Norfolk, was only saved by his own death. Henry's displeasure was the reward of those who served him best. Wolsey, Cromwell, and now the Duke of Norfolk, had been fattened, as it were, for

the slaughter. Wolsey escaped the penalty of high treason by dying in his bed, and the king's summons to a higher tribunal in the night of 27th January alone respited the Duke, who was to have suffered on the 28th.

The destroyer of chantries founded one for his own soul by leaving £600 for annual Masses and four solemn obits in the year. There is no appearance that his bequest was ever executed, unless indeed the Princess Mary cherished his wish in her faithful heart, and remembered it when she came to her kingdom.

Henry died at Whitehall, and his body was conveyed by road to Windsor. It rested for one night within the desecrated walls of Syon Abbey, and there it is said¹ Fr. Peyton's prophetic words at Greenwich received their accomplishment: "Where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall the dogs lick thy blood, even thine".¹

¹ Mrs. Hope, *Franciscan Martyrs in England*, p. 36.

CHAPTER IV.

CRANMER'S BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.—

A.D. 1547-1553.

THE funeral of Henry VIII., conducted with the outward pomp of ceremonial, was the funeral of the Catholic religion for the time being, till its brief resurrection in the reign of Mary. A boy of nine and a half now succeeded to his father's titles, and, whilst he was supreme head by inheritance, he was necessarily a tool in stronger hands for all purposes of government. The sixteen executors named by Henry's will practically gave way first to Edward's maternal uncle, the Protector Somerset, and after Somerset's execution, to the Duke of Northumberland. The only dogmatic act of Henry's which endured, was spiritual supremacy, and this proved to be a cancerous affection in the body of his Church. The Six Articles, which had constituted his creed, fell to the ground, and he was scarcely in his grave before the Erastianism of his State Establishment was fully demonstrated. Bishops, who had renounced the source of spiritual orders and jurisdiction, disputed about Transubstantiation, or allowed Parliament to legislate on articles of faith. It will be

evident that whatever was thus imposed appealed to men from any motive except that of divine faith. Shifting opinions and “views” were substituted for the principle of authority.

Amongst his ordinances as “head in earth,” Henry founded six new sees, *viz.*, Westminster, Oxford, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol, and Peterborough.¹ It was only part of a larger plan which he had not carried out. The hierarchy was divided into the Catholic party, represented chiefly by Tunstall of Durham, and Gardiner of Winchester, and into the Calvinistic, headed by the Primate.

Cranmer’s first business after Henry’s death was to obtain from his sovereign, a boy of ten, a renewal of his archiepiscopal faculties and jurisdiction. “Supremacy,” he said, “was transferred to the Kings of England.”² All the bishops were required to take out new commissions, by which they recognised the Crown as the source of episcopal power and jurisdiction. Edward was his father’s son, and with a horror of “idolatry,” duly inculcated by his counsellors, he felt no scruple at exercising more than papal powers. The bishops were “upon their good behaviour” during the whole course of his reign. Their orders rested no longer on the Rock of Peter, but on a royal patent which bore the express clause: “*Quamdiu se bene gesserint*”.³

¹ *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, ii., 444.

² *Cranmer’s Works*, 303.

³ *Collier*, v., 180; and *Gasquet, Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, 43.

There was a marked distinction between the Catholic priesthood and the crown officials, who followed the lead of Cranmer, and it became at once apparent in what constituted the great controversy in Edward's reign,—Transubstantiation and the act of Sacrifice on which it rests.

The Privy Council regulated a new ceremonial of coronation appropriate to the occasion. Cranmer reminded Edward that as "God's vicegerent and Christ's vicar in his own dominions"¹ he was to provide for the due worship of God. At Easter Compline was sung in English in the king's chapel. At the opening of his first Parliament the boy king rode in state from Westminster to St. Peter's Church, where the Gloria, Creed, and Agnus Dei at Mass were sung in English, and the sermon was preached by Ridley. These steps were tentative; they were to lead up to a new liturgy in which the Mass had no place. It was only consistent to sweep away what King and Primate treated as a "delusion," "a practice sprung from lucre," and "heinous and abominable idolatry".²

Cranmer, who held his jurisdiction from the Crown, could not reasonably object to a royal visitation. In May, 1547, the king's commissioners, composed of laymen as well as ecclesiastics, had orders to visit every diocese in England, and to summon before them the bishop, and the clergy, and the principal

Collier, v., 184.

² Gasquet, 253; Cranmer's *Works*, i., 353.

householders of each parish. They were to administer the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and to require an answer upon oath to thirty-seven points of inquiry relating to religion. The object of the visitation was to prepare the ground for the radical change which Cranmer and the king's council contemplated by tightening the reins of spiritual government in the royal hands. The seven hours of praise and prayer were curtailed to two, matins and even-song, whilst prominence was given to sermons and to the English tongue in public worship. The Book of Homilies, which the commissioners propagated throughout the country, was drawn up by Cranmer. Preaching became a matter of royal licence, which even bishops were required to obtain. All episcopal faculties and jurisdiction were suspended during the royal visitation, when the commissioners took upon themselves the office of bishops at King Edward's word.¹

Bishop Gardiner's tardy confessorship now began. He would not subscribe to the demands of the commissioners, and was lodged in consequence in the Fleet Prison, together with Bonner, Bishop of London. Gardiner had been led away by a personal regard for Henry VIII., which does him no honour. He had perhaps never realised that the royal supremacy was the overthrow of the Catholic religion. He was to gain the knowledge step by step, from his personal experience of a "strait" imprisonment.

¹ Lingard, vii., p. 19.

Later on he fought for the Mass and Transubstantiation, courageously yet vainly, since the basis on which they rested had gone. On the other hand, Cranmer's antipathy for Gardiner must be mentioned to his praise. During Edward's reign Gardiner never took his seat in the House of Lords, and he showed himself so opposed to the new measures that his enemies, Cranmer and Somerset, were glad to lodge him in the Tower.

The first Parliament of Edward VI. was called in November, 1547. It soon became evident what was involved in the attack made by the royal commissioners on the veneration of images. The "memories" of the saints had been cast out of evensong (vespers), and their statues pulled down and destroyed as idolatrous. Now, as a further development of the same impiety, it became necessary for Parliament to protect the honour of the most Blessed Sacrament. Two bills were passed, (1) for reverence to the Sacrament, (2) for communion under both kinds. Further, this Parliament dissolved the remaining chantries, thus discrediting foundations of Masses for the dead. It was not the dead, however, but the living, whom those in authority had chiefly in view. Convocation met almost simultaneously, and made a further breach in the citadel by considering the marriage of priests as desirable. The character of Convocation had not altered for the better since the act of supremacy. Born "deaf and dumb, it can neither hear com-

plaints in religion, nor speak in the redress thereof, till first *ephatha*, 'be thou opened,' be pronounced upon it by commission from royal authority".¹

In Catholic times Convocation was called when the Crown required money grants from the Church. After the assumption of the royal supremacy the king had no need to appeal through Convocation to a purse which he held in his own hands. He was lord of Convocation and of the body which it professed to represent.

Gardiner was in the Fleet Prison till January, 1548. He recovered his liberty for a few months, till, called upon to express approval of the new order, he answered by preaching a most eloquent sermon on what he considered "the chief foundation of our religion," the Mass. This test sermon, delivered in spite of Somerset's remonstrances that he would be silent on the Blessed Sacrament and the Mass, sent him a prisoner to the Tower in the summer of 1548. It was thought that he would not leave it except to die.

In Gardiner's absence the opposition to Cranmer in the hierarchy was led by Tunstall of Durham. The bills of Parliament in favour of the Blessed Sacrament produced an effect analogous to that of the Jansenist book, which was wittily called *De l'Infréquente Communion*. The movement for communion under both kinds was distinctly heretical at that time. For the wisest of reasons the disci-

¹ Fuller, quoted by Fr. Gasquet, p. 77.

pline of the Church had given it up for several centuries in practice, for one century formally.¹ The bill enabled Cranmer to bring forward a document which was to issue in the Order for Holy Communion. He aimed at displacing the act of sacrifice for one of devotion and thanksgiving. "The Mass," he said, "is neither a sacrifice propitiatory, nor of laud and praise."² He substituted the creature's offering for the Creator's sacrifice. "We offer up ourselves, our souls, our bodies, our alms, praises, and prayers."³ This document is assigned to January, 1548, and contains a series of questions relating to the Mass. The bishops to whom it was submitted were asked what the Mass meant; what it was *for*: for sacrifice or communion; whether it should be done away with as a sacrifice. Cranmer had already abolished it in his own mind. "It was," his answer said, "only a memory and representation" of the sacrifice of the cross. Still he did not think the popular mind ripe for entire renouncement, and his Order for Holy Communion was a *via media*. Four bishops rejected the Mass with Cranmer. Their defection would not have signified materially in Catholic times, but they were of great importance now that the hierarchy instead of being world-wide was only English.

The Order of Holy Communion was completed in

¹ Since the Council of Constance.

² Cranmer's *Works*, i., 352.

³ Jewell's *Works*, ii., 773.

March, 1548. To all intents and purposes its sole object was to provide for the new act of Parliament, which made Communion under both kinds compulsory. In reality it went further. It not only detached Communion from Mass, it also restricted it to certain days, which intending communicants were to notify beforehand to the parson. The privilege of daily or frequent Communion was thus taken away, but Cranmer's Communion was not the Catholic banquet of which he who eats hungers still. As to the rite itself, it presents evidence of an heretical spirit. It would seem to be the work of one who had given up Transubstantiation for Consubstantiation. There is a pointed iteration of the words "bread and wine," whilst the communicant is exhorted to receive the body "which was given for thee".

Sundry grave and well-learned prelates, according to King Edward's proclamation, were the authors of this order. They are known as the celebrated Windsor Commission, from the place of their assembly, though their names have not been recorded. "The first fruits of godliness," as Protestants termed the *Order*, served as an introduction to a further step, which was already apparent to those who had eyes to see. "It was expected," wrote the French ambassador to his master, "that there would be some commotion in this Parliament (1547) for the Sacrament of the altar, which *it was wished to abolish*; nevertheless it will remain for the present

as people think, although the Protector and the chief nobles do not *use* it any more at home among their families, where they act as badly as, or worse than, the sacramentarians in Germany.”¹

The second session, November, 1548, proceeded to deeds. Previous to the unseemly debates on what had constituted the faith of England for centuries, the proposed new liturgy was submitted to the bishops. In December the spiritual peers were again discussing the Sacrament of the Lord’s Body, with the result that Cranmer’s mind on the subject carried the day. It may be broadly stated in the phrase that he gave up the Real Presence for the real absence. Transubstantiation is the only basis for an abiding presence, and that he emphatically renounced. Christ was received by the good, not by the bad, without intermixture of substances, and the act of Communion began and ended the working of the Holy Eucharist. Cranmer was opposed to any sort of reservation, and without Transubstantiation, there could be no reason for it. The blow which had struck the Head, was now aimed at the heart of Catholic life. Thirteen bishops followed Cranmer’s lead, ten were against the new measure. Heresy was in the book, said the Catholic portion of the hierarchy, that is to say, the heresy of omission. Transubstantiation was gone, and with it the whole worship of the Blessed Sacrament. Cranmer sub-

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 72.

stituted a memory for the thing, at best a spiritual Communion, and this was imposed on the country in the “new book, which displaced the traditional liturgy”¹.

The order of Communion had not been enforced by act of Parliament. It was otherwise with the first *Book of Common Prayer*. The innovators in England, who had broken away from Catholic unity, put before themselves an impossible ideal,—the unity of error. The first Act of Uniformity, 1548, states the Government’s intention of imposing “a uniform, quiet and godly order, rite and fashion of common and open prayer and administration of the Sacraments,”² as set forth in the manual of Common Prayer.

The Committee, appointed by the king’s highness “of the most learned and discreet bishops and other learned men of this realm,” headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, was sitting during a part of 1548. The book appeared in 1549. The only certain thing about its authorship is Cranmer’s share in the work. The names of the other twelve “learned and discreet men” on the Committee are unknown. To the initiated it bears the unmistakable impress of his spirit. Two things had to be conciliated: a language outwardly Catholic with an essence anything but Catholic. Consequently as a

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 183.

² *Ibid.*, p. 136.

monument of human ingenuity Cranmer's Prayer Book has taken a high place. Bearing in mind the double object in view, Catholic forms with heretical matter, he carefully culled the new book from four principal sources: (1) the ancient English Uses, chiefly Sarum; (2) the Breviary of Cardinal Quignon; (3) the Greek liturgies; (4) the Mozarabic, or ancient rite of Spain.

The first portion of the book represented the Breviary, the order for Matins and Evensong daily throughout the year: the second the Missal, *viz.*, the Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass: the third the sacramental rites, or the Ritual. The "Commination Service," the conclusion, had no counterpart in ancient liturgies.

Two Sacraments,¹ Baptism and the Lord's Supper, were all that remained. The *rites* alone of Confirmation, Matrimony, and Holy Orders were maintained: Penance and Extreme Unction were obliterated. The two Sacraments maintained by Cranmer's Prayer Book were left with a grudging hand. No one can read the Zurich letters, in which the English innovators opened their hearts to the Swiss Calvinists, without arriving at the conclusion that the soul of innovation would have rejoiced in having no Sacraments at all.

¹ "Two Sacraments," Sandy's *Works*, 87; Coverdale, i., 79; Jewell, ii.

The "Book of the Communion," as Cranmer calls it, presents the kernel of the whole question, and in comparing it closely with the old rite, it will be seen that "the ancient ritual oblation with idea of sacrifice was swept away".¹ As far as the creed the Mass was maintained, though not the Latin tongue. With the Offertory, which begins preparations for the Sacrifice, the change was inaugurated. The Offertory was replaced by a verse of Scripture, during which the "minister" was ordered to lay the bread and wine "without any ceremony" on the altar. Then came the preface in English, and the canon or most sacred portion of the Mass. Its character was radically changed. The elevation was prohibited and the words, "sacrifice of praise," "holy and undefiled sacrifices," as applied to the Mass, are carefully eliminated. The terms, "our sacrifice of praise," and "lively sacrifice," are maintained in one prayer, but it is made perfectly clear that they refer to our offering, not to our Lord's, and this was Cranmer's interpretation of "sacrifice of praise".²

The words of institution are Lutheran in expression and in meaning: "Hear us (O merciful Father), we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 196.

² *Ibid.*, p. 209.

Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ". Between the Catholic words "that they may *be made unto us*," and the Prayer Book of 1549, that *they may be unto us*, there was the essential difference of the Catholic Church and of Cranmer's mind. The Archbishop, with his shifting views, knew at least what he did not want.

"We do not pray that the creatures of bread and wine may *be* the body and blood of Christ," he wrote, "but that they may be to *us* the body and blood of Christ, that is to say, that we may so eat them and drink that we may be partakers of His body crucified, and of His blood shed for our redemption."¹

With the exception of the Lord's Prayer, the *Pax Domini*, and the *Agnus*, the remainder of the Mass, if Mass it can be called, was entirely new. An invariable prayer was introduced after the priest's communion. It was a significant adaptation of a Sarum prayer in which "Qui me refecisti de sacratissimo corpore et sanguine" was rendered: "Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of Thy most precious body and blood".²

The order for administering the Sacraments was as Lutheran as that of the Lord's Supper. A Mass bereft of the canon was no Mass, and it was the canon in particular which Luther swept away, and Cranmer after him. Before the new book was

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 205.

² *Ibid.*, p. 215.

imposed Cranmer had gone beyond his own work.¹ He had already gone too far for popular feeling, which greeted the new Prayer Book with defiance and insurrection. Under the Act of Uniformity it was to come into force on 9th June, 1549, and opposition to be crushed out by penalties. Any one attempting to hinder the clergyman from using the book was to be fined ten pounds for the first offence, twenty for the second, and for the third he was to forfeit his goods and suffer imprisonment for life.²

The imposition on an unwilling people of the new order was the match which caused a long smouldering flame to burst forth into a conflagration. The country had not yet recovered from the suppression of religious houses. The suppressor and the new proprietors had been the worst enemies of the poor, King Henry by destroying their employment under the religious, the lay proprietors by pulling down their houses and turning them adrift. In 1547 it was enacted that whosoever "lived idly and loiteringly for the space of three days 'became' a rogue and a vagabond," and liable to a most cruel punishment. When a man was convicted of having so loitered, the letter V for vagabond was burnt upon his bare breast in red-hot iron, and he was made the slave of his informer for the period of two years. It happened sometimes that priests and clerks, unable, owing to the destruction of deeds, to prove their

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 234.

² *Ibid.*, p. 236.

orders, fell under the statute as far as the branding was concerned.¹ Religion was at the bottom of the popular grievances, which the new Prayer Book strengthened, consequently within a few weeks of its first use on 9th June, 1549, the whole country from the Bristol Channel to the Wash was in a state of ferment. Yorkshire, Oxfordshire, Norfolk, Devon and Cornwall were, however, isolated, and brave as was the opposition, it gave way before the royal troops swelled by foreign mercenaries, chiefly German and Italian. Lord Grey de Wilton commanded the forces in Oxfordshire. "The Oxfordshire Papists," says a contemporary, "are at last reduced to order, many of them having been apprehended, and some gibbeted and their heads fastened to the walls" (August, 1549). "Some of the priests," ordered Lord Grey, "were to be hanged on their own steeples." The Italian mercenaries in his pay made short work of the insurgents, "batches of whom they massacred without pity or mercy. In addition to this, 200, including several of the clergy, were taken prisoners, most of whom were well flogged and then starved to death; while twelve of the bravest and noblest leaders were strung up and strangled. For the clergy a special gallows was erected on the leads of their respective churches, where, in some cases, their exposed corpses, either whole or quartered, were preyed upon by ravens and carrion crows."²

¹ Lee, *King Edward VI.*, p. 55.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122.

The men of Devon and Cornwall were preparing a new “ Pilgrimage of Grace ”. In their petition, drawn up by a priest, John Moreman, they ask for nothing more than the Catholic faith, as they and their fathers had always practised it.

“ We will have the Masse in latten, as was before, and celebrated by the Pryest wythoute any man or woman com’unycatyng wyth hym.

“ Item we wyll have the Sacrament hange over the hyeghe aulter, and there to be worshypped as it was wount to be, and they which will not thereto consent, we wyl have them dye lyke heretykes agaynst the Holy Catholyque fayth.

“ Item we wyll have the Sacrame’t of ye aulter but (*i.e.*, only) at Easter delyvered to the lay people and then but in one Kynd.

“ Ite’ we wyl have holy bread and holy water made every Sondaye ; Palmes and ashes at the tymes accustomed ; Images to be set up again in every church, and all other auncient olde Ceremonyes used heretofore by our Mother the Holy Church.

“ Item we wyl not receive the newe Service because it is but lyke a Christmas game, but we wyll have our olde Service of Mattens, Masse, evensong and procession in Latten as it was before. And so we the Cornyshe men (whereof certen of us understa’d no Englysh) utterly refuse thys newe English.

“ Item we wyl have everye preacher in his sermon and every Priest at hys masse, pray specially

by name for the soules in purgatory, as owre fore-fathers dyd.

“ Item we wyll have the Byble and all bookeſ of Scripture in Englyſh to be caſled in agayn, for we be informed that otherwiſe the Clergie ſhal not of lo'g time conſound the heretykes.”¹

The royal message in answer to this petition was a further proclamation of the king's power. Indeed the same method of conviction was employed as in the Northern risings: terror and bloodshedding. The people, who constantly witnessed martial law applied to their pastors, were finally struck dumb. Fear did its work, especially with the young generation, not however before Cranmer's Prayer Book had cost “ thousands of Englishmen their lives ”.²

Cranmer's mind, as exhibited in his Prayer Book, does not inspire a sense of security in his Ordinal. Up to 1548 the Sacrament of Holy Orders was conferred by the ancient Catholic formula. It had now become only a rite. When it is remembered that the Archbishop had given up the Mass and Transubſtantiation, no one could expect that he would ſpare the priesthood. He proceeded stealthily in his ſcheme of deſtruction. By the new Ordinal, which paſſed the Lords in 1550, bishops conferred the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons, they being themſelves functionaries of the Crown. The Crown, therefore, was recognised as

¹ Lee, p. 126.

² *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 254.

the source of Orders and Jurisdiction. The bishop received no mitre, ring, nor crosier, neither was the priest anointed.¹ Five bishops protested against the Ordinal, and one, Heath of Worcester, went to prison for his opposition. He suffered the usual penalty, deprivation, and, what was worse, seeing a traitor to the Catholic faith installed in his place. Latimer, who proclaimed the Mass to be “a foul abomination,”² was intruded into the See of Worcester, and Poynet, nominated to Winchester during the lifetime of Gardiner, was the first pastor consecrated by the new Ordinal.

A worship which had cast out both Sacrifice and Presence did not require an altar. “An altar was for sacrifice, and a table for eating; the latter, therefore, was more proper for the solemnity of the Lord’s Supper.” The rubric fully authorised the changing of altars into tables, and the king, who was lord of the rubric, could command “that all altars should be taken away in the diocese of London, and tables set up in their room”.³

Throughout the country altars were in process of destruction. At Norwich the substitution of a “decent table” was made easy by the resignation of Bishop Rugg. Bishop Day of Chichester went to prison for the altars just as Heath had gone for refusing the Ordinal. Bonner, Bishop of London, did not give up his cathedral without a valiant

¹ Collier, v., 376.

² Latimer’s *Works*, i., 237.

³ Collier, v., 420.

fight. At the test sermon which Cranmer and the council required him to preach in September, 1549, he "maintained with all his might the corporal presence in the Lord's Supper".¹ He was sent to the Marshalsea, and Ridley, an advanced innovator, was intruded into his see.

The See of Westminster, vacant by Thirlby's appointment to Norwich in lieu of Rugg, gave Ridley a freer hand at St. Paul's, *Paul's*, as it was now called. One of Ridley's first acts in his cathedral was to order "the light of the altar to be put out before he came into the choir" (April, 1550). He maintained that "the Mass was never mentioned in the New Testament, that it makes the creature into the Creator, and that Christ is not offered up therein, *as Papists say*".² During the ensuing month of June all altars in the London parish churches were taken away, and a table put in their stead for the Communion.

The first Prayer Book was confessedly only a temporary measure. Cranmer's views showed forth the most salient feature of heresy: they were mutable. The sanguineness of Bishop Gardiner, after two years' imprisonment in the Tower, served a special purpose. He was determined to put a Catholic construction on the Prayer Book of 1549, and his very insistence on certain doctrines obnoxious to Cranmer's soul induced the revision in the

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 244.

² Ridley's *Works*, pp. 12, 51, 112.

Calvinistic sense, which resulted in the second Book of 1552. The points on which Gardiner fixed as evidence that "the new liturgy did not reject the old belief" were swept away and altered.¹ To us it seems idle to have entered into controversy with Cranmer respecting Transubstantiation and the Mass, but it has enabled all succeeding generations, if they would, to define the unfaith of the body Cranmer represented.

Gardiner's attempt to put a Catholic interpretation on the first Prayer Book was therefore refuted by Cranmer point by point, first in his answer to Gardiner's book on the Holy Eucharist, published in 1551, and, secondly, in order to suppress any similar Catholic glosses in the future, in the Prayer Book of 1552. Gardiner's vain delusions with regard to the book of 1549 centred in the supposition that the Mass and Transubstantiation had been retained. Cranmer emphatically denied the existence in his book of any such "papistical conceits". The substance of bread and wine was not changed, neither was adoration of the sacrament to be tolerated. The words used in administering the Holy Communion did not imply Christ's bodily presence, nor were there any grounds for reserving the sacrament since its virtue was restricted to the moment of Communion.

Gardiner has had many imitators who have sought to put a Catholic construction on formulas which

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 289.

contained very little Catholic doctrine. It was resolved to correct such ambiguity in what was really the second edition of the Prayer Book. Others, besides the Bishop of Winchester, might construe the words and acts of the new liturgy into a belief in Transubstantiation and all that it implied. Therefore "many things should be changed," and, if the bishops would not agree to the necessary changes, the king would do it himself.¹

The second Prayer Book swept away all the points which had given satisfaction to Gardiner. The words which had seemed to imply Transubstantiation and adoration of the Holy Eucharist were left out, and the form of administering Communion was pointedly altered. The new order ran: "Take and eat this," without making any mention of our Lord's Body and Blood.

The first Prayer Book destroyed the essence of the Mass; the second its sequence, as the collect, epistle, gospel and creed alone remained in their original place. The word "altar" was also entirely expunged.

A change in the same spirit was noticeable in the ritual for administering the two remaining Sacraments, and the scanty rites still tolerated. It reflects the mind of Cranmer, the author of the second, as he had been of the first, Book.² Cranmer had long passed his Lutheran phase and

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 284.

² *Ibid.*, p. 287.

entered upon his “Reformed” tendencies, which, in their turn, were faithfully echoed in the Book. The innovators were classed broadly under two heads, Lutheran and Reformed, pending the time when their differences should be legion. Reformed and Calvinistic were almost synonymous. The men to whom the second Book was submitted, Bucer and Peter Martyr, hated nothing so much as what they would have called the idolatry of Transubstantiation, and the “heinous” blasphemy of the Mass. Whilst Cranmer was eager for their approval, he was perfectly indifferent to the opposition of his protesting fellow-bishops. Gardiner was in the Tower and about to be deprived; Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, was in prison; Day of Chichester, Heath of Worcester and Bonner were likewise deprived. Consequently the new Bill for Uniformity, introducing the second Book, passed in April, 1552, and it was accompanied by a further act, which made the new worship compulsory on every one. The Book came into force the following November (1552), and remained in use till 1553, and the Prayer Book of the Cannon Row Commission was adopted in 1559. With a few alterations it was practically that of 1552. The first Book, 1549, may be described as Lutheran; the second, 1552, as Calvinistic; the third, 1558, as Elizabethan, and the most un-Catholic of the three.

In the brief reign of Edward it is said that 4000 perished either by the sword or the executioner,

in their struggle to maintain the Catholic faith.¹ His days were numbered, and in the beginning of 1553 it became evident that the young king was declining. He had been brought up in hatred of the Catholic religion, which he honestly thought idolatry. The king-worship of those days was so excessive that it probably never shocked his youthful mind. The adoration, which Edward, and still more his counsellors, grudged to the Blessed Sacrament, was shown to his own person. The French ambassador, describing the service of a royal repast, was struck by its abjectness. Even the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth were required to kneel when they spoke to him.² Men who would not adore God transferred their worship to their king, and to quote St. Augustine's words, their error was their God.³

¹ Lingard, vii., 46.

² Lingard, 104.

³ “ Error meus erat Deus meus.”

CHAPTER V.

MARY THE CATHOLIC.—A.D. 1553-1558.

EDWARD VI. expired at Greenwich on 6th July, 1553, and, as in the case of Henry VIII., his death was kept secret for a few days. The one person, however, whom it most concerned, learned it that very night, and at once acted on the intelligence. Princess Mary was then at Hoddesdon, near London. Without losing a moment she mounted her horse and rode with her household to Kenninghall, in Norfolk.

Edward's violent hatred of the Catholic faith had destroyed his sense of justice, and induced him to set aside the claims of Mary in favour of a Protestant succession, but, whilst *he* was in earnest, those about him used Protestantism for their own advancement. Lady Jane Grey was the innocent tool of her father-in-law, the Duke of Northumberland. By placing her on the throne in virtue of her royal blood and her Protestant sentiments, he aimed at sovereign power for himself. The proclamation of Queen Jane was received in sullen silence, without a spark of enthusiasm, whilst from Framlingham Mary claimed the allegiance of her loyal subjects, which they were not slow to give. Thirty thousand rallied to her

standard, brought her triumphantly to London, and eclipsed the girl of sixteen, who was as the shadow of a queen.

Since her girlhood suffering had been Mary's portion. Her mother's wrongs, her father's cruelty and injustice had fallen heavily upon her. During her brother's reign she had behaved with admirable prudence, holding herself aloof from political parties, and clinging with all her soul to the Catholic faith, in spite of the ceaseless persecution its practice entailed. All through his reign Edward was trying in vain to make Mary accept Cranmer's Prayer Book, and she was protesting against it. "Your new service shall never enter my house," she said on one occasion to Edward's commissioners, the Chancellor Rich, Wingfield and Petre. "If you bring it in, I shall not stay in the house." The last attempt to shake Mary's constancy was made by Ridley, who wanted to preach before her. In bidding him farewell the Princess thanked him for his visit, but for his offer of preaching she could not thank him, she said. Let him preach, if he liked, in the parish church. Neither she nor her household would attend.

The Mass continued to be the centre of her life, and when she came to her throne her first and most ardent desire was to restore to her people all that her father's apostasy had taken away.¹

The prisoners, kneeling on Tower Green to welcome their rightful sovereign, received her royal kiss

¹ Zimmermann, *Maria die Katholische*, pp. 34-37.

and pardon as she said: “Ye are *my* prisoners”. Amongst them was Bishop Gardiner, who had in a measure atoned for his former subservience by his long imprisonment. Even Mary’s clemency could not save the ringleaders who had plotted against her rights. Of the twenty-seven names submitted to her, she struck off twenty, ordering only seven for immediate execution. The queen of nine days was committed to the Tower, whilst her ambitious father-in-law, the Duke of Northumberland, received the just retribution of his offences. He was beheaded on 18th August, after he had first sought and obtained reconciliation with the Church. In his last hour, when beyond hope of pardon, he made a good Communion, proclaiming his full belief in the bodily presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. He had been seduced, he said, “theis sixteen yeres past by the false and erronyous preaching of the new preachers”. The Catholic faith he most faithfully believed to be the “very right and true waie,” and he ascribed to the innovators the “great plagues and vengeance which hath lighte apon the whole realme of Ingland”.¹

Mary spared the life of Lady Jane Grey for some months. It afflicted her to sign the death-warrant of her unfortunate cousin, though if she had listened to those around her there would have been no delay. As long as Jane lived, they argued, the Queen’s throne was not safe. At last Mary regret-

¹ *Chronicle of Queen Jane and Two Years of Queen Mary*, 18, 21.

fully consented, and Jane was beheaded in February, 1554. Jane had not the guilt of apostasy on her soul, as she had been born and bred in Protestantism. Her tone of mind was Calvinistic rather than Anglican. On the subject of the Blessed Sacrament, for instance, she was as flagrant a heretic as Cranmer.

The real enemy to Mary's throne was not Jane, who was simply the unwilling instrument of another's ambition, but Elizabeth. On the proclamation of Jane, Elizabeth feigned illness in order to see how events would turn before she decided on her action. It was always her habit to cast in her lot with the conqueror. When Mary was proceeding triumphantly to enter her capital, Elizabeth finally determined to play her part as sister, and she joined the Queen, well-nigh in possession, at the head of 150 horsemen. She as little understood loyalty as a noble nature understands intrigue. The Queen's kindness to her met with no return except ingratitude; for every plot against Mary had a stronghold of support and sympathy in the false soul of Elizabeth. She was an opportunist in religion as in all else, outwardly a Catholic in Mary's reign, a Christian perhaps in name. As a sister heartless and false, she would have been a sufficient trial, but Mary seems to have had her own reasons for thinking she was no sister at all, and the opinion was common to many at the time.¹ Mary, whose

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 135, and *Life of Jane Dormer*, edited by Fr. Stevenson.

mother had suffered so grievously through Anne Boleyn, was never to have a moment's satisfaction in Anne Boleyn's daughter.

The Queen, through a court of delegates, at once restored the deprived bishops, Gardiner, Tunstall, Bonner, Heath and Day, and expelled the intruders. Gardiner, the new lord chancellor, performed the ceremony of her coronation, which took place on 1st October with extraordinary magnificence. By the Bill of Attainder which Cranmer had drawn upon himself for his treasonable doings in Northumberland's conspiracy against Mary, he was *ipso facto* deprived of his see and of his spiritual faculties. A heretic as well as a traitor, he angrily denied his readiness to sing Mass before the Queen. The devil, he said, meant to set up his own invention, the Mass, instead of the pure worship of God.¹ It is needless to add that the "pure worship" was Cranmer's invention.

Mary's first Parliament, which was summoned a few days after her coronation, proceeded to restore the Catholic religion. The point which gave security to the whole, the Papacy, was a longer matter. Twenty years of abuse had told in the minds of Englishmen, who even in Catholic times were remarkable for their insularity and dislike of foreigners. From Norman days they had been disposed to forget the spiritual chief in the "foreign potentate". It was a great step to re-establish the

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 53.

Mass, the celibacy of the clergy, the virginal life, and the Communion of Saints, and to condemn the Book of Common Prayer as “a new thing, imagined and devised by a few of singular opinions”.¹ In abrogating the ecclesiastical ordinances of Edward VI. in favour of canon law, it became a question of testing true Orders. Those conferred by the Catholic Ordinal were of course valid, whilst Cranmer's Ordinal was notoriously inefficient.

A fifth part of the clergy in the diocese of Canterbury² had imitated Cranmer's example by marrying. The restoration of canon law made it necessary to deprive all such married clergy of their benefices. Gardiner, with the Pope's secret approval, consecrated Catholic prelates to supersede the seven Protestant bishops who still remained in possession.³ As their jurisdiction had been bestowed by the Crown conditionally *quamdiu bene se gesserint*, the Crown could take it away. The Bishopric of Durham, which had been dissolved by Parliament, was refounded.

The important question of the Queen's marriage was discussed, and three candidates were proposed : Courtenay, Cardinal Pole (who was not at that time in priest's orders), and Philip of Spain. The Queen considered herself bound to marry in order to secure the objects she had most at heart, and it soon became apparent that her choice was fixed on Philip.

¹ Lingard, vii., 140.

² *Maria die Katholische*, p. 70.

³ Lingard, vii., 174.

In all her acts of external policy she was unfortunate ; no government ever needed strength and wisdom more than hers. She may naturally have looked for support to her mother's family, yet probably the whole course of events would have been altered if she had married an Englishman.

The first result of the projected Spanish marriage was what threatened to be a very serious insurrection. Wyat was a mere instrument for wreaking the vengeance of France on the Queen, who was choosing, as the French king surmised, a powerful husband. All through her reign she had to count with the selfish policy of France. Unmindful of her great desire to restore the Catholic faith, Henry II. and his advisers seemed determined to sow and foster difficulties.¹ Elizabeth was their rallying point at court, and had Wyat's insurrection succeeded, she would have been proclaimed queen. Elizabeth's loyalty alone could have protected Mary's throne against their machinations. It did not exist, though she was ever ready to utter the most solemn protestations of innocence. Later on Elizabeth judged others by her own lax standard. In her code a princess so near the throne would have been removed as a measure of public safety. In fact, she was herself in the self-same position as Mary Stuart under her rule, and Mary, with none of her guilt, was sacrificed.

Queen Mary saved her crown by her courageous

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 59.

appeal to the citizens of London. A few only of the ringleaders were put to death. Wyat himself suffered. He admitted Elizabeth's knowledge of a scheme for her marriage to Courtenay, and subsequent proclamation as queen. Two letters of Wyat to the princess implicated her further, and are a clear proof of her complicity. Elizabeth was saved from execution only by the amendment of the law, which was passed in February, 1554. Under Henry VIII. full consent to traitorous designs constituted high treason. Mary's amendment made it necessary to prove a treasonable deed: Elizabeth had been too clever to afford proof to the Privy Council.¹ She was sent to the Tower instead of to the scaffold. The lesson was not severe considering the provocation, but it seems to have been ineffectual.

Mary's marriage with Philip of Spain took place on 25th July, 1554, at Winchester. Charles V. had ceded to him the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, in order that he should be a king, who married "so great a queen". The husband of Mary's choice has suffered from the misapprehension and injustice which have weighed heavily on her own memory. He was ten years younger than the Queen, of most engaging appearance and manners. He is described by contemporaries as "irresistible," and to Mary he was an "ideal husband". Personally he could not fail to be popular. He had the gracious kindness which in any station wins hearts, and he was generous.

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 84.

The baseness of the current coin, an evil which Henry VIII. bequeathed to the country, was improved only by Spanish gold. Charles V. had sent immense sums of money to England, and Philip, too, was royally lavish. The English, however, would not be gained to Spain. Philip's grandes received the most ignominious treatment, and were openly taunted with drawing money away from England, whilst in reality they were filling its empty coffers. Philip's diplomacy, perhaps also his natural kindness, made him befriend Elizabeth. He much desired her marriage with the Duke of Savoy, but he never at any time wished to marry her himself.¹

Philip remained in England for a year after his marriage and supported the Queen in what she considered the great work of her reign. Her first Parliament had opened negotiations for the restoration of the Catholic religion. Reconciliation with the Holy See presented a double obstacle, for besides national feeling in the matter, Church property had been hopelessly squandered and alienated. Mary would have wished to make a thorough restitution, but it was beyond her control. Julius III. therefore, by a Bull of 5th October, 1554, gave Cardinal Pole special faculties to deal with Church property according to the requirements of the situation. The Bill of Attainder against Pole was withdrawn, and he came to England in November, 1554, as Papal legate *a latere*. On the 30th, St. Andrew's

¹ Zimmermann, p. 125.

Day, whilst the King and Queen sat in state at Whitehall, he addressed both Houses of Parliament, telling them that “his principal business was to restore the nation to its ancient nobility: to this purpose he had an authority from his Holiness to make them part of the Catholic Church”.¹ The principal motives of the English revolt, the Cardinal said, had been avarice and sensuality. It was first started and carried on by the unbridled appetite and licentiousness of one person. There was more liberty of conscience in Turkey than in England. Parliament had apostatised by carrying out the evil commands of Henry VIII., and Parliament now expressed the national repentance. The Cardinal spoke the words of solemn absolution over the representatives of England on their knees. Two days later when the papal blessing was given by Pole, Gardiner preached an eloquent sermon at St. Paul's Cross in which he bitterly regretted his own defection. Convocation accepted the decision of Parliament in restoring the Pope (6th December) and the sovereign ceased to be supreme head. Mary threw away the “birthright of supremacy”² which her father had bought for so heavy a price.

The Queen's clemency had so far saved Cranmer from the traitor's death he had earned for himself by his seditious proceedings both before and after Edward's death. His conduct and his pen found many imitators amongst the innovators. The

¹ Collier, vi., 87, 88.

² *Ibid.*, vi.

scurrilous writings of Cranmer, Knox, Goodman, and Bale undermined the royal authority on the plea of the Queen's religion. When public prayers were ordered for the happy birth of her expected heir, Protestant fanaticism added a further petition to God "either to turn the Queen from idolatry or to shorten her days".¹ Many were the devices of the faction to heap insult on the most sacred Catholic mysteries: Mass and the Blessed Sacrament in particular, were objects of their most bitter hatred. Bourne whilst preaching in St. Paul's barely escaped with his life, and a priest at St. Margaret's, Westminster, was wounded in the act of giving Communion. "Loyal and peaceable Protestants under Mary were solitary exceptions."² As a rule they were seditious and seducers of the multitude, in strong contrast to the Catholic sufferers under Elizabeth who died for their faith, not for their want of allegiance. The treatment of those who would neither live in peace nor allow others to do so, became a serious question for Mary's government. In order to preserve her throne from utter destruction, its chief enemies were sent to the stake. However much we may deplore the necessity for so strong a measure we can hardly doubt that it existed. The majority of those sent to death for heresy were disturbers of the public order. The government is an ambiguous

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 95.

² *Ibid.*, p. 103.

term. In Mary's time, it signified the Privy Council, but the proceedings of the Privy Council were sanctioned by the nation at large. Religious "opinions" were only just coming into fashion. Mary, and with Mary Englishmen generally, took the old Catholic standing-point of truth and falsehood, "to be or not to be".

The people's attachment to their old faith and to the Queen was whole and hearty. It was the nobility who failed her, partly because their position favoured worldliness and so rendered them accessible to change, partly because they had, as it were, tasted blood, in receiving the spoils of the Church. One of Mary's greatest political errors was her too strong belief in the nobility. Elizabeth, who gained her experience by her shrewd observation during Mary's reign, addressed herself to the people with well-known success.

Of the whole 270, who suffered under Mary for heresy, which was another word for sedition, 120, the product of London, were examined by Bonner. The bishop's confessorship in the prisons of Edward VI. had matured his natural gifts. His knowledge of canon law and his moderation fitted him to pronounce on cases of heresy, of which London was specially productive. Bonner's action in the matter began and ended with those who in ordinary course of justice appeared before his tribunal. He never made it his business to hunt out heretics through private inquiry, and consequently failed to satisfy

the Privy Council. In the days of Queen Elizabeth things were exactly reversed. Her bishops showed a burning zeal for the persecution of "Papists," and were wont to complain to Cecil if his subordinates failed to denounce them.¹

The first prosecutions were conducted by the lord chancellor, Gardiner, in January, 1555, and the first to suffer under the revived statutes were Hooper, deprived Bishop of Gloucester; Rogers, a prebendary of St. Paul's; Saunders, a London, and Taylor, a country, rector. Gardiner opened proceedings over which Bonner afterwards presided. In a sermon preached before the court at this time, Alphonso di Castro, Philip's confessor, strongly denounced the putting to death of heretics. "It was not by severity," he said, "but by mildness that men were to be brought into the fold of Christ."² Whether the friar spoke from the abundance of his own heart, or from another's prompting, it is certain that his conviction was shared by all. Neither Mary³ nor Philip nor Cardinal Pole nor a single bishop on the bench viewed the burnings otherwise than as a measure of urgent necessity. Fr. Alphonso's words stayed the Smithfield fires for a few weeks, when the detection of a new conspiracy in the Eastern counties quickened the general sense of insecurity and prompted the government to renewed activity against the gos-

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 99. ² Lingard, vii., p. 192.

³ *Maria die Katholische*, pp. 100, 102.

pellers who were the usual offenders on these occasions.

Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer were typical of the band which they headed. They might have been justly called political criminals, for one and all they had conspired against Mary. It had not been Cranmer's fault that she had finally succeeded in gaining what was her own. Cranmer had been declared guilty of high treason and deprived, yet his sentence was still unexecuted. He and the party which he led distinguished themselves by abuse of the Mass and of Transubstantiation. It would be difficult, therefore, to assign an excess in this to Ridley and Latimer. Ridley devotes several pages of his works to explain why he abstained from the Mass, and speaks of its "abuses and blasphemous petitions".¹ To Latimer it was worse than "a foolery"; he viewed attendance at the Mass as a sin.² Ridley and Latimer were burnt at Oxford in October, 1555. They tried without scruple to shorten their sufferings, Latimer successfully, Ridley to less purpose, although he too became unconscious as soon as the fire reached the gunpowder. The plan was to place a bag containing gunpowder between the legs, in the arm-pits, or round the neck. The first contact with the flames produced an explosion. Others invited their friends to despatch them with the sword. These devices were

¹ Ridley's *Works*, pp. 103-110, 119.

² Latimer's *Works*, ii., 58, 192, 441.

commonly adopted by those who suffered under Mary.¹ At the time of Fr. Forrest's martyrdom Latimer had petitioned as a special favour to be allowed a seat in order to contemplate it, yet it is needless to say that devices to hasten death would have been rejected by Fr. Forrest's conscience.

Cardinal Pole was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in November, 1555, and by a strange coincidence he received the priesthood on the very eve of Cranmer's sentence, 20th March, 1556. Cranmer's seven recantations did not profit him, whilst they confirmed the general impression of weakness and disloyalty which he left behind him. At last, in face of inevitable death, he declared his true mind, which was fidelity to his errors. So he died, but he could not undo the wrongs which his "unworthy hand" had perpetrated by holding it in the flames.

In all the outward misfortunes, conspiracies and disappointments of Mary's reign, her true success has been overlooked. She brought about the renovation of the hierarchy, and scattered the fruitful seed which was to perpetuate the Catholic faith in England during weary centuries. Her nominations were inspired by the purest zeal for God's glory. Courtier bishops with the train of evils which they inflicted on their dioceses, had been a marked feature in England's apostasy. The Marian bishops would have done honour to the Church in

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 103.

any land. Gardiner and Bonner were by birth and education of Wolsey's school; they recognised their former errors, and had wiped them out by confessorship; Tunstall, Day and Heath had likewise suffered imprisonment. Of the remaining bishops, Watson, White, Goldwell, Bourne, Aldridge, Oglethorpe, Warton, Pate, Thirlby, Turberville and Scott were tried men. Many of them subsequently proved their worth in the prisons of the Anglican Queen. "There is not a single instance of an Edwardian bishop, consecrated after the Protestant ritual," *viz.*, Cranmer's Ordinal, "having been rehabilitated by Cardinal Pole, or admitted to the possession of an English bishopric in Queen Mary's time".¹

The hierarchy were one and all inspired with Cardinal Pole's conviction that Catholic reformation was to begin with themselves. "He did not incite his clergy to persecute heretics," says Burnet, "but to a thorough renovation of spirit. He well knew that a holy life on the part of priests would triumph over all difficulties, and outweigh even the truth."²

The Cardinal's zeal was hampered by the unwillingness of the nobility to acquiesce in measures which might affect their purses. The clergy, on the other hand, professed themselves ready for any sacrifice, whilst they pointed out the difficulties of

¹ W. Maziere Brady, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland, 1585-1876*, p. 25.

² Quoted by Fr. Zimmermann, p. 119.

restitution in the case of land which had constantly changed hands. The Queen was prepared to restore the Crown's share of Church property, thereby lessening her revenue by 200,000 ducats. This was not enough. She could not, she said, in conscience receive payments of tenths and first fruits, which had been given to her father as head of the Church. She had abjured the title, and all that it involved. Mary thus expressed her mind to her Parliament in October, 1555, whilst Cardinal Pole went to the heart of the question in the Synod of Westminster (December). Whilst the Synod was sitting he was nominated Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal *priest*.¹ The Synod, in fact, in which ten canons concern the bishops and clergy, largely reflects his mind. The first canon set apart the 30th of November in every year as a day of solemn thanksgiving, the anniversary of the national reconciliation with the Holy See. Pastors were to give up their whole time and thought to their flocks, and not to busy themselves with worldly concerns. A bishop was required to preach every Sunday and feast-day, or to appoint some one in his place, and to reside in his diocese. All pomp and superfluity were banished from the episcopal household, and the table of a bishop was restricted to three or four dishes. Only true vocations to the priesthood were to be admitted and the bishops were admonished to examine the candidates. Provision was made for

¹ Zimmermann, *Kardinal Pole*, pp. 307-312.

the erection of diocesan seminaries, and for episcopal visitations.

The Carthusians were reinstated at Shene, and the Franciscan Observants at Greenwich. The Bridgettine nuns, who had taken refuge in Flanders under Edward, returned to their religious home, Syon Abbey. By decree of Edward the see of Westminster, founded by his father, had been dissolved and its revenues given to the see of London.¹ Westminster was restored to the Benedictines, and Feckenham became first abbot. A Dominican convent was founded at Smithfield, and Peryn, a famous controversialist and preacher, installed as first prior.²

It was with Mary, as with many others who are doing a great work for souls, which is to survive themselves and many generations. She did not see the good, whilst trial, misfortune and catastrophe were all around her. The blessing of a child was denied her, nor did she enjoy for long together the presence of the husband she dearly loved. Philip left England in 1555 and was absent till the spring of 1557. In the following July he bade farewell to the Queen and never saw her again.

By a complication of circumstances the Spanish alliance told disastrously against Mary's restoration of the Catholic faith. Philip was the sworn enemy of France, and all through Mary's reign she had to contend with a hostile French policy, which was

¹ *King Edward VI.*, p. 142.

² *Kardinal Pole*, p. 364.

often directed against herself personally, without any regard either to her good right or to her faith. To its dishonour it must be said that France favoured the illegitimate false-hearted Elizabeth rather than the Catholic Queen, solely because she had married an enemy. Just, too, at a critical moment, May, 1555, Paul IV. ascended the Papal Chair. As Gian Pietro Caraffa he had not been a friend to Reginald Pole. As Pope, he perpetuated the disastrous policy of Clement VII. in allying himself with France against Spain, whose power he wished before all things to humble. The new Pope was already in his eightieth year, and feared Byzantinism as an enemy to the Church far more than Protestantism. The Duke of Alba had invaded the Papal States in September, 1556, and the outcome of the expedition was not favourable to the Pope. When Mary could no longer close her eyes to the insults, public and private, offered her by Henry II., her declaration of war against France seemed to Paul IV. almost equivalent to war against himself. Philip had been for some time engaged in hostilities with Paul IV., and had vainly striven to draw Mary into his quarrel. She was a patriot in the best sense of the word, and would not, without grave reason, involve her country in war. It was declared against France in June, 1557. English arms were successful at the Battle of St. Quentin (August, 1557), and at Gravelines (1558); yet the loss of Calais cast a gloom over the expedition, and caused

the Queen a sorrow from which she never recovered. The word "Calais," she said, would be found written on her heart.

The real strength of England lay not in French, but in colonial possessions, and here again the loss experienced under Mary was ultimately an immense gain to our country. The pretensions of our kings to French territory were nothing short of insane, and in modern history can perhaps be best compared to the first Napoleon's campaigns. Calais was the last remnant of English power in France, and an expensive possession. With it passed away an unprofitable dream, and Englishmen turned their practical minds to the discoveries of new lands, which were then taking place. Mary probably did truer service to England by concluding an important commercial treaty with Russia than she would have done by maintaining Calais, a purely show possession.

Deeply as the Queen grieved over the loss of Calais, it was not her bitterest sorrow. Paul IV., in consequence of his unfortunate policy with regard to the House of Spain, recalled all his nuncios who were acting in countries under the dominion of Spain. Cardinal Pole, although not falling under the measure, was included in it. His mission as papal legate was at an end. This blow, coming from the Pope, severely tried the Queen's fortitude. All her representations were in vain. Pole himself urged the necessity of a papal legate, upon which

Paul IV. nominated the Queen's confessor, Fr. Peyto, the courageous Greenwich Franciscan, who had always upheld Katherine's cause. He was now eighty years old, his age alone being an obstacle to his new duties. The Queen was placed in a cruel alternative, either of treating the Holy See with disrespect, or of allowing the faith in England to suffer, according to her human prevision. It would have been the more perfect way to have shown unwavering obedience to the Pope, even when he was in the wrong, and to have committed the cause of souls to God. Mary could ill afford to lose the personal support of Cardinal Pole, and in this single instance her obedience to the Holy See was defective. Peyto was never officially informed of his new dignity, for by the Queen's orders the papal rescript was held secret. Cardinal Pole remained in England not as papal legate *a latere*, but as Archbishop of Canterbury,¹ which made him *ipso facto legatus natus*. His staying on at all in England was contrary to the Pope's orders. A competent historian² says that those orders could not command his obedience. One point alone is clear, Pole was placed in a most painful dilemma, and he chose what seemed to himself the lesser evil.

For both Queen and Cardinal the night, in which no man can work, was at hand. Mary's ill-health

¹ *Maria die Katholische*, p. 144.

² Pater Zimmermann, *Kardinal Pole*, p. 384.

had made it all along apparent that her days on the throne were numbered. She died at seven in the morning of 17th November, 1558, after she had most devoutly heard Mass in her dying chamber ; Cardinal Pole at seven in the evening closing his day's work with Vespers and Compline.

All Mary's dying wishes were disregarded by the false sister who succeeded her on the throne, intent only on worldly wisdom. Elizabeth had drawn three important deductions from Mary's reign. She had seen the disadvantages of a foreign alliance for a queen regnant ; she had recognised the people's strength and the nobility's weakness ; and she had duly noted the kind of religion which would flatter the English mind, Calvinism in the outward garb of a State Church. Queen Elizabeth lost no time in acting on her experience and in sweeping away the edifice which Mary had laboured to build, yet Mary bequeathed a very real inheritance to her people. But for her temporary restoration, Elizabeth might have gone further and succeeded in stamping out the Catholic faith. Mary had relighted the beacon which was to illumine the dark night of persecution, a poor result perhaps in the eyes of the world, a splendid success in the eyes of God.

CHAPTER VI.

ELIZABETH: BEFORE EXCOMMUNICATIO.—

A.D. 1558-1570.

ELIZABETH succeeded to her sister's crown with every sign of good-will on the part of the people. Archbishop Heath duly set her claim before the Lords and Commons, presenting by his conduct a marked contrast to Cranmer's behaviour on Edward's death. The strength of Elizabeth's title lay in its weakness, for in reality she had no title at all, but her claim fostered the national feeling and that was during all her reign her stronghold. If she was set aside, Mary, Queen of Scots and consort of France, inherited the English crown through Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII. The sin of her parents was visited upon Elizabeth and placed her from the first in a false position. With no real claim to the throne, she occupied in the nation's eyes the position of heiress presumptive, that is, of Henry's legitimate surviving daughter. Catholics looked for justice, Protestants for high favour, therefore both were satisfied, and it is easy under the circumstances to understand that the Church in Rome and the Church in England took different views as to Elizabeth's right. The ardent

Paul IV. at once declared that he could not recognise a bastard queen, whilst the highest dignitary of the Church in England, the Archbishop of York, calmly presented this same bastard to the nation as the rightful sovereign. The question may be solved in this way. The Pope had to deal with the abstract, the Archbishop with the concrete. It seemed simpler to take Elizabeth for what she appeared to be than to expose the country to the evils of a disputed succession.

The Archbishop reaped no reward for his generosity, and Paul IV. died (1559) before the reign of terror for Catholics had well begun, not, however, before the Queen had given proof of what she meant to be.

When Elizabeth gathered up the reins of government in her strong hand, she had to make good a weak cause. As the daughter of "the principal cause and wet nurse of heresy," she considered herself pledged not so much to those who called themselves Protestants, as to heresy in general, to all, in short, that was not Catholic. She knew instinctively that heresy and heretics would support her in return. She appealed therefore to the class who repudiated the faith of fifteen centuries, and accepted all her father's inheritance as far as the Church was concerned. Her Privy Council was divided about equally into Protestants and Catholics, the Protestants being her nominations, but it was rather an honorary than a working board. Eliza-

beth transacted her important business through a secret Cabinet, headed by Sir William Cecil, and composed of his particular friends.¹ The character of Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley (1571), is well known. He played with the false religion as with the true, belonging in fact to the large class of creedless individuals, who live only for this world. Sir Francis Walsingham, Cecil's fellow secretary of state, was more than a match for him in cruelty, intrigue, and wickedness. Sir Nicholas Bacon received the great seals in room of Archbishop Heath. With these men as chief counsellors Elizabeth prepared to carry out a programme which she and her most confidential advisers had drawn up at Hatfield immediately after Mary's death. The contemplated change of religion was threatened by the Pope's probable excommunication of herself, which would entail enmity on the part of certain foreign powers. There would be opposition at home from Mary's advisers, the bishops and clergy. The plan was to involve both bishops and priests in *Præmunire*, which would force them upon the Queen's mercy. A commission of seven under the presidency of Sir Thomas Smyth was charged to prepare the new liturgy. Their sittings were to be held secretly in Cannon Row.² When the Queen had secured her objects and could allow the curtain to be withdrawn, all would be in readiness.

¹ Lingard, vii., p. 252.

² Spillmann, *Die Englischen Martyrer unter Elisabeth*, p. 7.

Whilst there was no ambiguity in her mind, she allowed it to appear in her acts. On one or two occasions, however, she almost betrayed herself out of season. She had buried Queen Mary, whose last will she disregarded, with full Catholic ritual, but Bishop White of Winchester was imprisoned for the sermon he preached at the funeral. He could not indeed praise the dead sister without seeming to imply blame on the living, so different were they. As Bishop Oglethorpe of Carlisle was preparing to say Mass in the royal chapel on Christmas Day, he received orders from the Queen not to elevate the sacred Host. The bishop replied that his life was the Queen's but that his conscience was his own. Elizabeth stamped her foot, and retired with her ladies after the Gospel: the bishop continued his Mass.

Another warning was given by proclamation on 27th December, forbidding the clergy to preach or to alter the established worship before the meeting of Parliament.¹ Elizabeth sufficiently showed her hand, and the bishops became thoroughly alarmed. They met in London to discuss the question whether they could lawfully crown the new sovereign, and refused to a man. Finally Dr. Oglethorpe of Carlisle was prevailed upon to perform the ceremony. He made no concession as to the rite. The full Catholic ritual was to be carried out, and Holy Communion administered under one kind. The

¹ Spillmann, p. 9, and Lingard, vii., 256.

bishop was under the erroneous impression that he could reconcile the act with his conscience. On Christmas Day he had risked his life to elevate the Blessed Sacrament, and proved his fortitude. It is said that remorse for having crowned Elizabeth shortened his life, which ended within the year (1559). The princess, who could consult an astrologer as to a lucky day for her coronation, be guided by his decision, and then perjure herself by taking a solemn oath to maintain the Catholic religion, would not be likely to regard the consciences of others. On 15th January, 1559, which Dr. Dee had pronounced a propitious date, Elizabeth was crowned Queen of England. Regardless of her perjury and of her sacrilegious Communion the new Queen now began to set aside the mask. On her progress through the city on her coronation day a child offered her an English Bible, which she kissed and clasped to her heart. A few days later Parliament was summoned, the "beardless" Parliament, which was definitely to abolish the Catholic religion till the Emancipation Act of 1829.

Lord Keeper Bacon in his opening speech told the two Houses that they were to co-operate in providing England with a uniform order, but that at the same time the Queen had no absolute need of their services. In the plenitude of her own power she was well able to prescribe a religion. What followed was in fact the expression of Elizabeth's sovereign will. Instead of calling herself "supreme head on earth," she be-

came in virtue of the new Act *gubernatrix ecclesiæ*, supreme governess, or rather, she took her father's position entirely, altering only her title, a distinction without a difference. But Henry had always been a devout believer in the Mass. In this respect the "governess" went beyond the supreme head. The beardless Parliament did her bidding in three important particulars : (1) In again imposing the Oath of Supremacy on the clergy and a large number of the laity ; (2) in abolishing the Mass in favour of the new Prayer Book ; (3) in enforcing these statutes by grievous penalties.¹ Thus the first Act ordered that all ecclesiastical persons whatsoever, all civil servants of the crown, all magistrates and all taking any degree in the universities should be required to swear to the Queen's spiritual supremacy.² A first refusal involved the loss of position, or, in the case of a priest, of benefice ; the second, the punishment of *Præmunire* ; the third, death with all the penalties of high treason.

The second Act made the Cannon Row Prayer Book compulsory, and abolished the Mass. It enacted that the Book of Common Prayer alone should be used, and "to sing or say any common or open prayer, or to minister any Sacrament, otherwise . . . than is mentioned in the said book . . . in any cathedral or parish church or chapel or in any other place," subjected the offender to forfeiture of

¹ Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, p. 1.

² Jessop, *One Generation of a Norfolk House*, p. 62.

his goods, and on a repetition of his offence to imprisonment for life.¹ In a lay man any deed or word in dispraise of the new book, any attempt to enable a priest to say Mass or administer any Sacrament, was punishable the first time with a fine of 100 marks.² If he did not pay it within six weeks, or find bail, he went to prison for six months. To the second offence a fine of 400 marks and one year's imprisonment were attached. For the third he lost all his property, and was a prisoner for life. A fine of twelvepence was exacted for non-attendance at the parish church. Besides the material ruin which stared them in the face faithful Catholics who refused to take the oath were called *Recusants*, and branded with social ignominy. These, at least, were the results brought about by Elizabeth's first Parliament. The new liturgy was to come into force on 24th June, 1559. With slight alterations it was the book of 1552, therefore the revised edition of Cranmer's Prayer Book. The passages which had given comfort to Gardiner had been swept away: the lay commission in Cannon Row worked for a *gubernatrix ecclesiae*, who feigned to abhor the Mass, Transubstantiation and the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament.

Convocation sat, as usual, simultaneously with Parliament, and this time it gave forth no ambiguous sound. Five articles were drawn up, which directly

¹ Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, p. 63.

² Value of one mark at that time, 13s. 4d.

condemned the attempt of Parliament to suppress the Catholic faith in England. Convocation maintained the Mass, the supremacy of the Holy See, Transubstantiation, and vigorously opposed the Queen's right to be *gubernatrix ecclesiae*. In an eloquent speech Archbishop Heath laid before his brethren all that separation from the Apostolic See involved.¹ Henry VIII., he said, was the first king who had assumed the title of supreme head, and at first no one either on the Catholic or the Protestant side had sanctioned the step. An honourable member had lately declared that the title belonged to the king as king. On those grounds King Herod should have been head of the Church of Jerusalem, and Nero the head of the Church in Rome!

The supreme headship of a woman was even more repugnant to Christian instincts, and Elizabeth soon proceeded to prove that a governess was as truly the source of spiritual jurisdiction as a "supreme head". In Easter week, 1559, she ordered a conference between Protestants and Catholics to be held in Westminster Abbey, as a pure form, for she did not intend genuine controversy. Eight champions appeared on either side, but proceedings had hardly begun before they were arbitrarily cut short by Lord Keeper Bacon, who was a good courtier. The Queen did not mean to give Catholics fair play, and as an immediate result of their ardour at the conference, Bishops

¹ Spillmann, p. 15.

White and Watson were sent to the Tower. These were preliminaries to the final step of deposition, which was carried out in July, 1559. The bishops were called upon to take the Oath of Supremacy and to administer it to their clergy. With the exception of Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, they refused the Queen's terms, and had to bear the weight of her sentence for the rest of their lives. Elizabeth thus stifled the last cry of the old Catholic hierarchy.

Fifteen bishops and four bishops-elect were deprived of their sees, whilst the twentieth, Robert Pursglove, Bishop Suffragan of Hull, likewise lost his position without suffering the heavy penalties, which fell to the lot of the diocesan bishops. He lived independently at Tidswell in Derbyshire till his death in 1579, making himself universally beloved.¹

Of these bishops, five died the same year; Tunstall of Durham, already an old man of eighty-five; Morgan of St. David, Baines of Coventry and Lichfield, Reynolds, elect of Hereford, and Oglethorpe of Carlisle, whose end, it is said, was hastened by grief for having crowned Elizabeth. Three ultimately managed to put the sea between themselves and the Queen's displeasure; the rest were placed in confinement or imprisonment. Few men in the annals of Church history have borne a more glorious testimony to the Catholic faith. They

¹ Spillmann, p. 35.

took their Master's bare cross to their hearts, lived on it alone, and passed away in most instances without rites or sacraments, and without Catholic burial.¹ Elizabeth's bishops could not provide for their spiritual needs, and the fact that no one of them ever contemplated the possibility should be noted as the strongest testimony against the Anglican ministry. The absolution of a priest if he be suspended, or otherwise under canonical censure, is valid, when none other can be obtained, *in articulo mortis*. Have the angels of Gethsemane ever borne a stronger cry of suffering to the Great Throne than the anguish of the last Catholic bishops, who, in dying, saw the abomination of desolation standing, if not sitting,² in the despoiled sanctuary?

Feckenham, the Abbot of Westminster, shared in the constancy and in the confessorship of the bishops. He had pleaded Elizabeth's cause with Queen Mary when she was in the Tower under charge of high treason, and certainly deserved her gratitude. The Queen offered him the Archbishopric of Canterbury on her usual conditions, but he absolutely declined to take the Oath of Supremacy, and chose the bitter alternative of imprisonment. Twenty-five years passed away for him, varied only by a different prison, till he died at Wisbeach Castle, 1585.

¹ Bridgett, *Queen Elizabeth and the Catholic Hierarchy*, p. 42.

² St. Chrysostom draws a distinction between standing and sitting in darkness.

At first the great mass of the clergy followed the hierarchy. In the long run, however, many took the Oath in order to keep their position. An act of duty becomes at times heroic and only heroic souls fulfil it. It is difficult to arrive at the total number of faithful priests, partly because men were sometimes more merciful than the law, especially in the North and in Lancashire, where the Oath was not invariably exacted. The royal visitors of the York province in 1559 summoned ninety priests to take the Oath. Twenty-one were favourable, thirty-six refused, and thirty-three did not appear at all. Twenty-five presidents of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge and thirty-seven professors at Oxford refused the Oath.¹ Those who took it did not act from conviction. Ruin stared them in the face if they refused.

How did the Queen feed the people whom she had left without pastors? She gave them Cranmer's Revised Liturgy, the book of 1552 as it issued from the Cannon Row Commission. It would have been difficult to put a Catholic construction on this production. The order for Holy Communion was reduced to its barest expression. The elements of bread and wine remained bread and wine after a consecration prayer, which merely offered them as such to God. The communicant no longer heard the life-giving Catholic formula at the moment of Communion.

¹ Spillmann, *Die Englischen Martyrer*, p. 37.

“Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee,” were the words substituted by the cruel invention of man. The altar of sacrifice had made way for “a table consisting of a pair of rude trestles and a horizontal wooden board,” and the Ten Commandments had been introduced into the communion service, chiefly, it is supposed, as a protest through the second commandment against the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament.¹

In 1550 whilst the Anglican Liturgy was in course of formation, the apostate Hooper, one of the leading reformers, left his wish on record. “The Mass,” he said, “was the sacrilegious invention and ordinance of man, and to partake of it was idolatry,”² therefore he hoped that no vestige of it would be suffered to remain. “As ye have taken away the Mass from the people, so take from them her feathers also, the altars, vestments and such like as apparelled her.”³

Even Cranmer’s Liturgy required, if not priests, at least ministers, and it was now the Queen’s business to provide for the sees which her supreme will had made vacant. The men she invested with a counterfeit episcopacy certainly presented a strong contrast to the Catholic bishops whom she had dispersed and imprisoned. Matthew Parker, who had been formerly in the service of Anne Boleyn, seemed

¹ Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth*, ii., p. 42.

² Hooper’s *Works*, i., p. 152, 312, and ii., p. 32.

³ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 276.

to answer the requirements of a queen's metropolitan. He was pliable, and perfectly ready to do her pleasure, except on one point. He took to himself a wife, and it was Mrs. Parker who, after a certain archiepiscopal entertainment at Lambeth, received the thanks Elizabeth was loath to bestow on an archbishop's wife. "Mistress¹ I may not call you," said the Queen, "Madam I will not call you, but whatever you are, I thank you."²

Elizabeth never favoured a married clergy, though the system she founded rested upon it.

The consecration of the Archbishop Elect offered two great, and, as it seemed, insuperable difficulties to which the irregularities of his election were as nothing. By Act 25 of Henry VIII. four bishops were required for his consecration. This condition did not in the least imply that four consecrated. One consecrates,³ nor can his deficiencies be supplied by any of the assisting prelates, supposing that they are duly qualified. The ceremonies of High Mass require priest, deacon and sub-deacon, but the priest alone celebrates. With the single exception of Kitchin of Llandaff the Catholic hierarchy was suspended, nor would even Kitchin have consented to consecrate Parker. Besides the lack of consecrator, there was no Ordinal. That of Edward VI. had been abolished by Mary's Parliament, and the

¹ Used instead of Miss.

² Sir John Harrington, *Nugae Antiquae*, p. 16.

³ Hutton, *The Anglican Ministry*.

Catholic Ordinal by Elizabeth's. The case was solved by six theologians and canonists, who declared that the Queen "through the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority" could supply every defect.¹ Parker's election was confirmed on 7th September, 1559. Barlow, the deprived Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Hodgkins, once suffragan of Bedford, who had been consecrated by the Catholic Ordinal, if at all; Scory and Coverdale, consecrated by the Protestant Ordinal, proceeded three months later to consecrate Parker. Barlow, his real consecrator, was canonically deprived, therefore he incurred gross irregularity, but there is very grave reason to doubt whether Barlow himself was ever consecrated at all.² There is no record of his consecration to his first see of St. Asaph. His sentiments were well known. He did not believe in the priesthood or priestly office. The Northern pilgrims in Henry's time had pointed him out as "a subverter of the Christian religion". His deeds were a logical outcome of the unbelief which was in him. In the course of a sermon which was noted and remembered against him, "he affirmed and said that wheresoever two or three simple persons, as two cobblers or weavers, were in company, and elected in the name of God, that there was the true Church of God.

¹ Lingard, vii., p. 263.

² See an excellent pamphlet by the late Mr. Serjeant Bellasis, *Was Barlow a Bishop?*

“ Item. That it is not expedient for man to confess himself, but only unto God, for He will at all times accept and take any penitent man or woman to His mercy if he cannot expediently have a priest.

“ Item. That there neither is nor was any purgatory ; but it is only a thing invented and imagined by the Bishop of Rome and our priests to have trentals and other mundane lucre thereby.

“ Item. That if the king’s grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, nominate and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop ; that he, so chosen (without mention made of any orders), should be as good a bishop as he is, or the best in England.”¹

Lastly, even if Barlow had been a true bishop, and a true Catholic, not a heretic, he used Cranmer’s Ordinal, which was notoriously powerless to confer Holy Orders. It has been clearly seen that the one thing Cranmer aimed at destroying was the altar of sacrifice, and all that it involved. The whole question of Orders and Jurisdiction in the Church of England rests upon Barlow, a man possibly not consecrated himself, an undoubted heretic, who did not believe in Church or priesthood, and who used to consecrate Parker an Ordinal, which did not convey, and was not meant to convey, the powers of the priesthood.

Parker was consecrated at Lambeth Palace very

¹ Collier, iv., 388.

early in the morning of 17th December, 1559. Barlow not being an archbishop, all the four bishops when laying their hands upon Parker's head said the words : "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and soberness".

The power bestowed by this formula is not specified. No unction was used nor was any pastoral staff delivered to Elizabeth's archbishop.¹

Parker confirmed the election of Barlow to Chichester and of Scory to Hereford, and by degrees the sees were filled with representatives of the new order, which was committed to the Act of Uniformity, the spoliation of religious houses, and the abolition of the Mass.

Parliament had confiscated to the Crown "all abbeys, priories, nunneries, chantries and hospitals" (May, 1559), and one stroke of Elizabeth's pen blotted out Mary's work of restoration at Greenwich, Smithfield, Shene, and Syon Abbey. The superiors of those houses, so recently restored by the Catholic Queen, preferred to leave England rather than take the Oath. The governess of her bishop's spiritualities showed a keen appetite for their temporalities also, and her advisers fed it. By a second Act her first Parliament had empowered her to take possession of the lands of a see during

¹ Collier, vi, 301 ; Lee, *Church under Elizabeth*, i, 66.

vacancy, with the exception of the chief manor and its domain.¹ On the deprivation of the Catholic hierarchy in July, 1559, all the sees, except Llandaff, became vacant. The new prelates expostulated in vain. They had to submit to be spoliated, and to receive their temporalities when and how it pleased their sovereign lady to bestow them (March, 1560).

Elizabeth had, in fact, legalised spoliation. An Act passed in 1559 empowered her to exchange the lands of any vacant bishopric for inappropriate tithes which had belonged to the monasteries of the diocese. The Act provided that the exchange should be on equal terms. The Queen being supreme governess, there was no one to raise objections during the vacancy of the see. In practice, therefore, she took what it pleased her to take, and imposed her own terms on bishops elect, who, from the nature of things, were bound to accept them for the sake of preferment. Grindal had scruples as to whether he should become Bishop of London on these conditions. He consulted Peter Martyr, and then, without waiting for an answer, acted on his own responsibility. The value of the lands taken from Canterbury alone was £1300, that is to say, several thousand pounds in our value. Not only did the Queen appropriate the revenues of sees, but she highly favoured vacancies, which were a pure gain to her private purse. The average vacancy of a see was two to three years. During Elizabeth's forty-

¹ Lingard, vii., 264.

four years Oxford enjoyed a bishop for exactly three years and six months,¹ and that bishop was Curwen.

Royal visitors went to Oxford in June, 1559, deposed the faithful Catholic professors, and established heretics in their places. If Jewell may be trusted, the University was a stronghold of orthodoxy. "Two monks had eradicated the seed which Peter Martyr had sown with so much care." All over the country, the state of the flock, bereaved of bishops, priests, and teachers, may be surmised. It is estimated that the number of vacant parishes reached 3594.² The policy of the government in furthering Anglicanism was unfortunately strengthened by priests who took the Oath even against their consciences. Time was gained, and whilst the perplexed people were looking to everything except their own effort to save them, the momentous change was made. A few years later, it is true, they expressed their feelings in a new Pilgrimage of Grace, but for the present they trusted to circumstances. A brave and determined resistance would have stopped even Elizabeth's hand. Instead of offering it, they paid her fines, exposing themselves to ruin, and the rising generation to spiritual famine, whilst they waited for something to happen. They may be forgiven for having thought

¹ Pocock, quoted by Fr. Sydney Smith, *How the Church of England Washed her Face*, p. 4.

² Spillmann, p. 38.

that the times were too bad to last. What they expected did not come to pass ; the hand of God was heavy upon them ; Elizabeth did not marry a Catholic prince, neither did Philip of Spain appear as a champion. Some compromised, and went to the Anglican service, protesting against it all the while in their hearts. The more enlightened stayed away and paid the fines. There were not two views about the new service, but some men tried hard to persuade themselves that a mere external attendance for form's sake could not be sinful. The Bishop of Avila, de Quadra, Spanish Ambassador in 1562, therefore put the question to Pope Pius IV., on behalf of English Catholics. It was submitted in this form to the Inquisition : "Under a government which prohibits the practice of the Catholic religion with capital punishment, and orders them (Catholics) to take part in conventicles where psalms are sung, portions of the Bible are read in the vulgar tongue, and heresy is taught, may Catholics obey the law without prejudice to their souls ?" To this the Holy Office at once answered : "No". The object of such attendance at church could only be to avoid the fine by seeming to take part in what was heretical. It would therefore be a denial of our Lord.¹

In those days absolving from heresy required special faculties. Occasionally, de Quadra reported to the Holy Father, priests possessing those faculties

¹ Spillmann, p. 42.

had been imprisoned, and *on being tortured*, had sometimes let fall their penitents' names. Accordingly Pius IV. gave the bishop the fullest faculties for absolving from heresy. As a foreign ambassador he was exempted from the English law, which already (1562), according to his statement, had countenanced the torture of priests.

De Quadra's predecessor, the Conde de Feria, had grasped Elizabeth's mind on the very outset, and she, on her part, seems to have expressed herself clearly to the Spanish Ambassador. Almost her first words as queen to de Feria were: "I am a heretic, a heretic, a heretic". She was a heretic from policy not from conviction. "I believe," wrote de Feria in 1559 to his sovereign, "that in a few days she would burn more Catholics than her sister burnt heretics." And again on 27th December, 1559: "I believe this woman has a thousand devils in her body".

The Bishop of Avila was not more flattering to her policy. "She wishes," he said, "to set Christendom on fire in order that she herself may reap the benefit."¹

Pius IV. on his accession to the Papal Chair made every effort to win Elizabeth, and with Elizabeth her kingdom. "And if so be (as we desire and hope)" were his words, "that you shall return into the bosom of the Church, we shall be ready to

¹ *Relations Politiques des Pays Bas et de l'Angleterre*, Kerwyn de Lettenhove, ii., introduction, xi.

receive you with the same love, honour, and rejoicing, that the father in the Gospel did his son returning to him ; although our joy is like to be the greater, in that he was joyful for the safety of one son, but you, drawing along with you all the people of England, shall hear us and the whole company of our brethren (who are shortly, God willing, to be assembled in a General Council, for the taking away of heresies, and so for the salvation of yourself and your whole nation) fill the Church Universal with rejoicing and gladness.”¹ The bearer of this letter, the Nuncio Parpalia, was not allowed even to land in England, and this at a time when Elizabeth assured de Quadra that she was as truly a Catholic as any in her kingdom (June, 1560). It will be seen, therefore, that there was strife between her convictions and her policy.

In the following year Pius IV. sent another Nuncio, who was to wait in Belgium for the Queen’s answer. Elizabeth again refused to allow him to land. Policy alone, which was her conscience, would have altered her attitude to the Pope and to Catholics. When once firmly seated on the throne, she could, and did, defy excommunication.

The Council of Trent and the Convocation of 1562, which produced the Thirty-nine Articles, were sitting simultaneously, and offer a perfect picture of the old and the new. The “whole company” of Christendom to which Pius IV. had invited Eliza-

¹ Lee, *Church under Queen Elizabeth*, i., 82.

beth to unite herself once more, promulgated its majestic decrees *urbi et orbi*. Elizabeth scornfully rejected a council headed by the Pope. The religion which she had adopted was national, and restricted to England ; yet in one particular the innovators went upon the old lines, and that was in imposing their creed on English consciences. They said anathema to all Englishmen who did not adopt it. In January, 1562, the Thirty-nine Articles were hastily drawn up, and received as they now stand the subscriptions of both Houses of Convocation, and the royal assent.¹ They form an exact antagonism to the decrees of Trent. Ever since 1562 they have formed the test of the aspirant to the Anglican ministry, who is bound by the Thirty-first Article to look upon the sacrifice of Masses as “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,” or else to perjure himself. The new creed of Thirty-nine Articles completed the Act of Uniformity, which had come into force on 24th June, 1559, with the new book drawn up in 1558, and abrogated Catholic worship in England.

Cecil’s diplomacy was active at this momentous time in trying to hinder the queen’s marriage with Dudley. The “virgin queen,” who never desired a lord and master in earnest, had far other requirements ; only objecting to the marriage ceremony. By degrees the Oath was exacted more rigorously. In the spring of 1561 Sir Edward Waldgrave and his wife were thrown into the Tower for hearing

¹ Lingard, vii., 319, and Collier, vi., 378.

Mass and harbouring a priest in their house. From the year 1562 onwards there was a marked increase in the prisoners for conscience' sake, *viz.*, for hearing Mass and refusal to attend the new service. The Parliament of 1563 emphasised the note of persecution.¹ The Oath of Supremacy was made obligatory for all members of the Commons, for all schoolmasters, lawyers, law clerks, for any one in short holding the smallest official appointment. A first refusal to take it incurred the penalty of *Præ-munire*, the second the pain of high treason.² The hopes of Catholics were to die away in weary years of imprisonment. A Tudor prison was a refinement of torture; the person of the prisoner was for the time being at the mercy of the jailer, who could exact money from him and allow him to starve without let or hindrance. Board and lodging were paid for at fixed rates, or sometimes lodging only, in which case the prisoners were required to provide their food at their own expense, and to pay those who looked after it. Prison fees were extracted on the merest pretence from the very poorest. Thus a Catholic yeoman paid ten shillings entrance fee; a gentleman twenty shillings; a landed proprietor forty shillings.³

The lot of those who incurred these terrible penalties merely for hearing Mass and refusing to attend the new service appealed most forcibly to the

¹ See Prothero for the Act itself, p. 39.

² Spillmann, p. 40.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

pity of Christendom. The Emperor Ferdinand in particular wrote to Elizabeth, September, 1563, begging her not to alienate by harshness the hearts of her Catholic subjects. Let them be allowed at least one church in the different towns, in which they might assist unmolested at the Holy Sacrifice and receive the Sacraments.¹ Elizabeth was inflexible. She tolerated only the religion she had established, and meant to enforce, for the reason that no one would embrace it from conviction.

Since the Catholic faith was outlawed from English soil, who was to provide for the needs of souls? God raised up a man, seemingly a David against Goliath, to do His work. A young Lancashire man, strong in faith and of ardent zeal, conceived and carried out a plan for educating priests beyond the seas for the English mission. William Allen was not thirty years of age at Elizabeth's accession, but he had lived entirely for the ends of study and piety. A brilliant university career laid an excellent foundation for his future labours. From 1562 to 1565 he used all his influence to induce Catholics not to attend the new service under any pretence whatsoever.² "There were priests," he wrote to a friend abroad, "who said Mass privately, then went to the Anglican worship, and took part in the Supper, thus on the same day partaking of the Chalice of the Lord and of the chalice of Satan."

¹ Spillmann, p. 44.

² Bellesheim, *Wilhelm, Kardinal Allen*, p. 20.

Allen laboured so successfully that he was an object of suspicion to the government. For a time he found a refuge in the house of the Duke of Norfolk, who three years later aspired to the hand of Mary Stuart and perished in her cause. In 1567 the Queen's order to the High Sheriff of Lancashire to secure the person of Allen, who wrote *the late Book of Purgatory*, found him an exile in Flanders, his pen and mind active for the Church.

In 1568 he opened in the Flemish town of Douai the seminary which was to embrace as far as possible all the needs of English souls. It offered the goods of community life to English students on the Continent, instruction in the Catholic faith to students and others, and above all it educated and trained devoted priests for the English mission.¹ God, who inspired Allen with the work, mercifully veiled the future from his hopefulness. To him, as to many others, the times seemed too bad to last, and to the end of his life he continued to speak confidently of English matters. In his youth he had seen still standing the fabric of Church and State as mediaeval times had made it. That outward beauty had passed away for ever, but the seminary priests, who risked their lives for England, constituted the heavenly beauty of the king's daughter, which is from within.

William Allen was raised to the cardinalate in 1587. In 1592 Cardinal Allen told his fellow-

¹ Bellesheim, *Wilhelm, Kardinal Allen*, p. 26.

workers to be of good heart “because the number of our brethren who bleed for God’s truth is complete,” little dreaming that his great work was only beginning its laborious career. Those who followed him at Douai directed their attention less to corporate reunion and more to individual souls. The Douai registers are rich in honourable names. Gregory Martin, who was learned in the Scripture, had a great part in the famous Douai Bible. Thomas Ford and Edmund Campion amongst others planted at Douai the vigorous traditions of the English Catholic University. The first missionaries went forth in 1574. They were Lewis Barlow, Henry Shaw, Martin Nelson, and Thomas Metham, two of whom found the reward of their labours at Wisbeach.¹ In 1578 the college with its seventy-five students and twenty-five priests was removed to Rheims. Every year it sent twenty priests to the English mission, that is, to almost certain death.

Elizabeth’s policy with regard to Scotland was now culminating in the long English captivity of the Scottish queen. *Poner fuego en la Christianidad para vivir ella descansada y ociosa.*² She had abetted the Calvinists in France and Scotland with men and money; she sought by every means in her power to injure a rival queen, but she did not

¹ Bellesheim, p. 43.

² Bishop of Avila to Duchess of Parma, Jan. 5, 1560. *Relations Politiques des Pays Bas et de l’Angleterre*, introduction, ii.

wish the world to think her a party to insurrection and treason.¹ In dealing with the Catholics in her kingdom she assigned to them her own low standard of morality, and credited them with doing what she would have done in their place and what she was actually doing in "la Christianidad". Elizabeth, supported by Cecil, had been engaged in undermining the throne in Scotland, whilst Mary Stuart was still a happy Queen of France, and her mother, Marie of Lorraine, regent of her northern land. The misfortunes of Mary began from the moment that she set foot on Scottish soil, and those misfortunes were largely due to the enmity of Elizabeth, whose grievances against Mary were her better title to the English throne and her faith. Elizabeth's penal treatment of Catholics defeated her own ends. Setting out with due loyalty to herself, they in course of time came to look upon Mary Stuart as the chief hope of the Catholic Faith in England. A widowed queen consort in 1560, a queen regnant for seven stormy years, Mary at last committed the fault of trusting the false sister Queen who had undermined her throne (1568). Her very presence in England gave consistency to hopes which would never have been cherished except for Elizabeth's policy. Her position, her beauty, her sufferings, her indescribable charm, pointed her out, whether on a throne or in a dungeon, as a queen of hearts. Yet there was one

¹ Lingard, vii., 281.

thing Elizabeth pardoned her less than her fascination. If the English Queen's mind ever rested seriously on her successor, it was gall to think that Anglicanism, her special creation, would give way to Catholicism once more.

In 1569 the Duke of Norfolk, not a Catholic in spite of his family traditions, aspired to the hand of Mary Stuart, and was supported by a strong party amongst the nobility, who would gladly have seen the succession question duly settled. Elizabeth opposed this marriage as she had ever opposed any plan for Mary's happiness. She gave orders that if the Duke dared to strike a blow for Mary, the Scottish Queen was to be executed.¹ He feared the consequences to Mary of pressing his suit, and abandoned himself, as she had done, to the mercy of Elizabeth, which lodged him in the Tower.

The presence of Mary may have contributed amongst other causes to the new Pilgrimage of Grace which marked the close of 1569. The Catholics, ground down by intolerable penal laws, may be excused if they built their hopes for the future on Mary's succession. Dr. Morton, a former prebendary of York, returned to Yorkshire about this time, charged by Pius V. to disclose to Catholics of standing the terms of the projected Bull of Excommunication. Dr. Morton's message no doubt increased the keenness of Catholics in Mary's cause, but what kindled the smouldering discontent in the

¹ Spillmann, p. 60.

North into flame was the fresh rigour attached to the Act of Uniformity. All persons of position throughout the kingdom were called upon to swear that they would forward the Anglican Liturgy, abjure the Mass, and frequent the new service.¹

The North had been singularly indisposed to obedience from the beginning of the penal legislation. Elizabeth was well aware of its disaffection, and proved it by ordering to London the two foremost Catholic leaders, the Earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland. The summons meant the block. Neither noblemen feared death, but the circumstances were critical. If ever a blow was to be struck for the faith of their fathers, that seemed the moment for it. Uniting their forces and unfolding the banner of the Five Wounds, they appealed therefore to the large number of those whose consciences had been tortured by ten years of penal enactments. On 14th November, 1569, they entered Durham, proceeded to the cathedral, where the communion table was thrown down, and the English Bible and Prayer Book torn to pieces. The solemn chimes pealed again for the Holy Sacrifice, which was celebrated to the great joy of thousands present in the cathedral. In all that region not ten noblemen had approved of the Queen's doings² as Supreme Governess. The two Earls led their forces victoriously southwards, everywhere restoring the Catholic worship. In their proclamation a few days later they

¹ Spillmann, p. 61.

² Lingard, viii., 46.

explained their purpose. Certain crooked and evil-disposed persons had for their own ends destroyed the true Catholic religion in England, thereby bringing disgrace on the Queen and kingdom. "We therefore are gathered together," ran the proclamation, "to meet armed force by armed force in order by God's help to stem the evil and give back to this fair land all ancient customs and liberties."¹

The people hungered for the Mass, and the sight of the venerable Sir Richard Norton bearing the pilgrims' banner filled them with hope and enthusiasm. They mustered 17,000 cavalry and 4000 foot soldiers. A detachment made for Tutbury with the intention of setting Mary Stuart at liberty. Her jailers, however, had already removed her to Coventry, and this was the beginning of misfortune. The liberation of Mary would have altered the course of subsequent events. As it was, division began to reign in the camp, and the Queen's army broke up the rising before a single real advantage had been won.

Her vengeance was terrible. Martial law for the poor who had taken any part whatsoever in the proceedings was proclaimed in the disaffected districts; Northumberland, Durham and Yorkshire having shown themselves warmest in the cause. Those who were not poor were allowed the semblance of justice, chiefly, it seems, that the Queen's exchequer might profit by their forfeited possessions.

¹ Spillmann, p. 63.

The poor were at once strung up in the market-places or parish greens, and their corpses were allowed to remain till they fell to the ground bit by bit. Any person suspected of having supported the pilgrims was ordered to arrest, and all the resources of a sharp imprisonment were used in order to induce him to reveal accomplices. Cecil's brain was fertile in these inventions. It is estimated that 900 of the poorer classes were executed in this summary manner. The Queen listened at last to representations. Whole districts would be made desolate, she was told, if her prosecutions continued. An ungracious pardon was then offered on condition that both the Oath of Allegiance and that of Supremacy were taken.¹

Martial law was accordingly served on the poor. The scant justice, or rather semblance of justice accorded to the better class, is far from redounding to the Queen's praise. The property of those thus convicted of high treason fell to her; therefore, when the local sentence did not favour her claims, the prisoners were sent up to London and submitted to the Star Chamber.

The Earl of Westmoreland escaped to Flanders, whilst the Earl of Northumberland was executed two years later in May, 1572. Catholic contemporaries looked upon him as a martyr, and he joyed to know that the cause for which he suffered entitled him to a martyr's crown. He was offered a

¹ Spillmann, p. 66.

free pardon on condition that he would apostatise. The closing scene was depicted by Circiniana on the frescoes of the English Church of the Holy Trinity, which have gained their honours for our martyrs. The frescoes were destroyed during the French occupation of Rome at the end of the last century, but engravings of them had been taken by privilege of Gregory XIII.,¹ which remained, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. There was no other indication of the Earl's personality than the words: *Quidam vir illustris capite plexus est*, consequently his name has not hitherto been included in the band officially recognised by the Church.² His honours are only postponed.

As far as living in this world was concerned, Catholics did not achieve any good by the Northern Rising. It served only to enrich the kingdom of heaven; for the hundreds of poor people, sent there by martial law and derisive forms of justice, died for their faith no less than the *quidam vir illustris*. St. Pius V. was filled with grief at the utter failure of Catholic hopes. Many ascribed it erroneously to the vague rumours abroad as to Elizabeth's excommunication, and thought that the time was come for the Holy See to speak plainly and without ambiguity. If the Pope declared her unfit as a heretic to reign, the moral atmosphere would be so

¹ See Decree of Congregation of Rites in Fr. Bridgett's *Life of Blessed Thomas More*, xxii.

² Spillmann, p. 67.

much the clearer, and a second attempt to establish the Catholic religion could not fail to succeed. The grief-stricken Pius V. determined to publish his Bull of Excommunication, in the hope of alleviating his children in England, but he counted on a Christendom too selfish to support his words with deeds.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FIRST ANGLICAN HIERARCHY.—A.D. 1559.

LITTLE has so far been said of the men who received from Elizabeth, not a crosier and mitre indeed, but the office and appointment of bishops in her State Establishment. They form at least a most striking contrast to the deprived Catholic Hierarchy, for, transferring all the rights of the Holy See to the sovereign, they rested as unsurely upon Erastianism as the real pastors rested securely on the Rock of Peter. The one was an exact antithesis of the other.

The Hierarchy thus created by Elizabeth depended for its orders on Barlow, who, whether he had himself been consecrated or not, had undoubtedly fallen from the faith. His consent to use Cranmer's Ordinal for Parker's consecration proves that he did not wish to found a line of sacrificing priests, but only to institute ministers whose election depended on the will of the prince. Twenty years before Elizabeth's accession, Barlow had clearly expressed his views: “If the king's grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop, that he, so

chosen (without mention made of any orders), should be as good a bishop as he (Barlow) is, or the best in England ".¹

Barlow's five daughters eventually married bishops of the sort he had helped to make.²

"God hath made me overruler of the Church," Elizabeth told her Parliament on one occasion; "if you, my lords of the clergy, do not amend certain faults and negligences, I mean to depose you."³

Her "lords of the clergy" understood their position. The Oath of Allegiance and Homage, which the bishop-elect took at the Queen's feet, determined the nature of his episcopal career. "I acknowledge and confess," it ran, "to have and to hold the said bishopric and the possessions of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as temporalities thereof, only of your majesty and crown royal of this your realm."⁴

Accordingly he read aloud her highness' injunctions four times a year, and in general obeyed her commands in matters spiritual. Her one counsel of perfection or propriety he disregarded. She disliked a married clergy; her bishops married nevertheless, and bore the brunt of her vexation. Parker himself expressed to Cecil his horror at the

¹ Collier, iv., p. 388.

² Gough, *General Index to the Parker Society's Publications, William Barlow.*

³ Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, p. 221.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 243.

Queen's view of "God's holy ordinance and institution of matrimony".¹

When Elizabeth heard that Pilkington of Durham had laid up a marriage portion of £10,000 for his daughter out of the revenues of his see, she indignantly remarked: "If the revenues be so mighty, and the Crown be so poor, my lord of Durham can surely spare us a little. We will charitably lighten his heavy burden for him somewhat." And she *did* lighten it of £1000 a year for the benefit of her garrison at Berwick.² This was the "lord of Durham," who piqued himself most justly on having broken with the past, and founded a new order of things. "In Durham," he wrote, "I grant, the bishop that now is, and his predecessor, were not of one religion in divers points, nor made bishops after one fashion. This has neither crutch (crosier) nor mitre, never sware against his prince his allegiance to the Pope; this has neither power to christen bells nor hallow chalices and superaltars as the other had, and with gladness praises God that keeps him from such filthiness."³

In all matters not connected with matrimony, Elizabeth's bishops consented to be "her clergy," not to make any innovation without her, and to refer spiritual questions hitherto taken to Rome to her

¹ *Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, 156.

² *The Church under Elizabeth*, i., 214.

³ Pilkington's *Works*, "Burning of Paul's," 586.

supreme tribunal. Lord Thomas Howard, who applied to Parker for a dispensation of age, in the matter of a benefice, was told in reply that it “appertaineth to the prince only”.¹

“Metropolitan according to the power you have under us,” as the Queen reminded her Archbishop of Canterbury upon occasion, he on his part was “ready to tarry or to forego the vocation your highness hath called me unto. God’s Majesty in you thus oftentimes appearing, I do reverence with lowly humility, referring all to your divine prudence.”²

Grindal’s troubles began as Bishop of London, where a canon of St. Paul’s created some disturbance by holding Transubstantiation. Grindal’s Calvinism objected even to the outward garb of Anglicanism, and though he pleased the Queen by remaining unmarried, he offended her seriously when, in virtue of her second translation, he became Archbishop of Canterbury, thus holding “the highest trust in the Church of England *next to herself*”. In 1570 he wrote to Bullinger that it “has seemed good to our most gracious Queen to translate me,”³ *viz.*, from London to York.

At his first northern visitation Grindal proved that he too looked upon an altar as “intolerable

¹ *Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, i., 43.

² *Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, 373, and Strype’s *Life of Archbishop Parker*, i., 43.

³ *Zurich Letters*, First Series, 224.

amongst Christians".¹ Accordingly, he ordered every parish to "provyde a decent table, standing in a frame for the communion table; and that no linnen clothes, called *altar clothes*, and before used about *Masses*, be laid upon the communion table". Furthermore, his injunctions dealt summarily with the "Communion bread," which was to be delivered into the people's hands without any ceremonies or showing of respect or worship. The Communion was to be received three times a year besides Ash Wednesday. "All altars were to be pulled to the ground, the altar-stones defaced, and bestowed to some common use." At burials no superstitious ceremonies to be observed, *i.e.*, no prayers of any kind were to be said for the dead. Elizabeth's northern archbishop was therefore on a fair way to carry out Peter Martyr's hope "that as altars and images were already taken away, so also those appearances of the Mass might in time be taken away too".² Whilst Bishop of London, Grindal had noted that of the Protestants of the realm none refused to be present at the new service. Some Papists came, indeed, but were loath to part with "the old Mass".³

Grindal was the only member of Elizabeth's Hierarchy who fell under her serious displeasure. She "restrained" him, that is, confined him to his palace for supporting the ranting Puritans whom

¹ Jewell's *Works*, ii., 735.

² *Life of Grindal*, 43, 224, 245, 248.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

she liked less even than Catholics. Grindal pleaded eloquently for the “prophesying meetings,” which were in reality far more akin to his own mind than a State Establishment. Of this same State Establishment he had full proof in a curious order from the Privy Council, issued in 1576 by the Queen’s command. Her highness (as she was then styled) had noticed that the observation of the “embering and fish-days” was carelessly maintained, to the great prejudice of “mariners and fishermen”. The Archbishop was required to enforce days of fasting and abstinence, “not for any liking of Popish ceremonies heretofore used,” but “only to maintain the mariners and the navy of this land, by setting men a-fishing”.¹ In Worcestershire Sandys was actuated by the same Calvinistic spirit. On a visitation tour he discovered an old altar-stone still standing in the parish church of Battenhall. He ordered it to be “removed, defaced, and at once put to some common use”. Being translated to London, he showed special favour to the Dutch Protestants, and suppressed for a while the Mass at the Portuguese Ambassador’s. In Yorkshire, for the Queen translated him a second time, his loose moral character and strong Calvinism found no favour. He failed even as a family man.² “Our Church,” he wrote in 1573, and the expression is to be noted, “is in a

¹ Collier, vi., 576, and Strype’s *Life of Archbishop Grindal*, 336.

² *The Church under Queen Elizabeth*, i., 216-223.

most wretched state of confusion.”¹ People who talk of “our Church” mean that they disbelieve in *the* Church. There was, however, a consensus against “breathings, exorcisms, oil, spittle, clay, lighted tapers,” the sign of the cross and the crucifix. Elizabeth’s bishops were much exercised by the cross in her chapel, for which some of them apologised to their Swiss brethren. Parker protested to Cecil against its reappearance, which “should be imputed to himself,” adding, that he had not been consulted, and thought it inexpedient.²

Jewell of Salisbury maintained that it (the silver cross) was “a little too much foolery”. “We are constrained to our great distress of mind,” wrote Cox of Ely, “to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross.”³

Cox is described as a prominent member of the Protestant party, which, during its exile for religion, had been far from a subject of edification to the world. His career was absorbed by mundane interests, and his life-long anxiety in the See of Ely was to secure a sum of money which, he supposed, Bishop Thirlby, the rightful bishop, owed to him: *rem, rem, quocumque modo rem.* To save his pocket he had allowed the Sacrament to be administered in an ale-house, and in his old age inquired of the

¹ *Zurich Letters*, First Series, p. 295.

² *Parker’s Correspondence*, p. 379.

³ *Zurich Letters*, First Series, p. 66.

Council whether he should “rate himself as a clerk or a layman”.¹

The Queen’s commands to Cox to give up a portion of his town property to a dancing courtier were therefore specially galling. The terms in which they were couched, prove that she had some knowledge of Cox’s antecedents.

“ PROUD PRELATE,

“ You know well what you were afore I made you what you now are. If you do not immediately comply with my request, I will unfrock you, by God.

“ ELIZABETH R.”²

At his death the See of Ely remained vacant for eighteen years. “Another bishop like Cox would have bred a revolution in the Isle.”³

Cox certainly had imitators in the Hierarchy. Bishop Scory of Hereford was charged with “the idolatry of wealth,” which would not of course have compromised his sacerdotal character, had there been any. Avaricious bishops had existed in Catholic times. The case of Bishop Barkley of Bath and Wells was different. He too was fond of riches, and accumulated them only for Mrs. Barkley “to carry them away”.⁴ This was an example *not* offered by Catholic centuries.

¹ Hall, *Society in the Elizabethan Age*.

² Lee, *The Church under Elizabeth*, ii., p. 16.

³ Hall, *Society in the Elizabethan Age*, 109-117.

⁴ Sir John Harrington, *Nugæ Antiquæ*, 150, 176.

Peter Martyr, the apostate, was frequently called upon to decide the scruples of men who worshipped the Queen and objected to the cross. Could “the just and legitimate authority of the Queen (not ‘the unlawful tyranny of the Pope’) enjoin the round cap and ‘popish surplice’?”

In the case of Grindal, Peter Martyr ruled that he should wear the obnoxious garments under protest, whilst preaching or administering the sacraments. It was greatly to be desired that the question of garments should not stand between the Saxon and Helvetian Churches.¹ Supposing that these new ministers of the word should be placed in the alternative of bearing the crucifix and lighted tapers, or of retiring from the ministry, what were they to do? It may be gathered that Peter Martyr recommended to all his correspondents toleration towards “the relics of the Amorites”.²

Naturally enough he could not deal with the question which arose after his own death, nor prevent Parkhurst of Norwich from receiving a silver image of himself (1564).

In 1562 Parkhurst wrote exultingly to Bullinger “that the crucifix and candlesticks in the Queen’s chapel are broken in pieces, and, as some one has brought word, reduced to ashes. A good riddance of such a cross as that.”³

¹ *Life of Grindal*, p. 45. ² *Zurich Letters*, First Series, 64.

³ *Ibid.*, 122, 136.

Peter Martyr's desire that the new Hierarchy might be "consecrated without any superstitious and offensive ceremonies, without oil, chrism, or tonsure," was fully carried out. Cranmer had gone further, for he had said that bishops "needed no consecration by Scripture, and there was no promise that grace is given with the office".¹ Ministers, not "sacrificing priests,"² were made by Cranmer's Ordinal, which aimed at doing away with the priesthood for ever. The substitution of a table for the altar of sacrifice, and of a Supper for the mystery of Transubstantiation, necessarily involved the abolition of the Mass.

Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter under Edward VI., was not actually a member of Elizabeth's Hierarchy, but as an assisting prelate at Parker's consecration his sentiments are worth recording. He distinguished himself on that occasion by wearing on principle a plain woollen garment. He translated several works of Calvin, remarkable for their bitterly anti-Catholic sentiments, which exactly represented Coverdale's mind. Perhaps he out-did Calvin in the extreme coarseness of his language against Transubstantiation. Commenting on the Psalmist's words, "Heaven is my seat and the earth is my footstool," he remarks, "yet will they truss him so short, that they will bring him into

¹ Cranmer's *Works*, ii., 116, 117.

² Latimer's words are "Sacrificing priests should cease for ever," ii., 255.

a little pix, wherein a man cannot turn his fist. . . . He was never visible to the mortal eye, and yet will they make him appear at every knave's request, that will do as other men do, I mean pay their ordinary shot.”¹ Elsewhere he asks “Wherefore they call it (the Mass) a sacrifice. Even because, say they, that in the Mass Christ the Son is offered up unto God His Father. Oh, what a great blasphemy is this; yea, to be abhorred of all virtuous men.”²

Dr. Hugh Curwen entered Elizabeth's Hierarchy in England in 1566. He began his episcopal career in Ireland as Archbishop of Dublin in succession to Dr. George Brown. His appointment took place in 1555 with all due formalities, and during Mary's reign he showed himself a zealously Catholic pastor. On the accession of Elizabeth, however, he turned away from the true faith because he could not face the sufferings its profession entailed. His apostasy practically ended his career as Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. He himself petitioned in 1560 to have an English see, but it was not granted to him till 1566, when he became Anglican bishop of Oxford in Elizabeth's Hierarchy. The fame of his virtues had not preceded him. On the contrary, his character laboured under heavy moral accusations, too grievous to be specified.³ His zeal in the cause

¹ Coverdale's *Works*, “Fruitful Lessons,” p. 427.

² *Ibid.*, *Remains*, p. 470.

³ Cardinal Moran, *History of the Archbishops of Dublin since the Reformation*, vol. i., p. 64.

of the Royal Supremacy had vitiated his sacerdotal spirit, and his dogmatical code consisted in blindly carrying out the Queen's orders. As in the case of Bale, Bishop of Ossory, the Irish wished for his recall far more ardently than he did himself.

The consecration of Adam Loftus, who, in 1562, became Archbishop of Armagh by Elizabeth's appointment, sheds a certain lustre in Protestant eyes on Dr. Curwen. Loftus occupies the same place in the Protestant Hierarchy of Ireland as Parker in the Anglican. The cases are not unlike. Curwen was a true bishop, but there is grave doubt whether Loftus had ever been ordained. Both Hierarchies, therefore, rest on insecurity as to orders and apostolical succession. The men, who tolerated until "better times" the sign of the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the Lord's Supper, walked faithfully in Cranmer's footsteps. No words could express his horror of the Mass, which he called "a device and doctrine of the devil".¹ He thought to have swept it away with "its manifold abuses, corruptions, and abominations". The absence of the Holy Sacrifice, in fact, made Elizabeth's bishops what they were. Everything connected with the Mass was denounced as "superstitious". Archbishop Parker (1566) gave instructions to the warden and fellows of All Souls, Oxford, to deface certain altar plate "for the avoiding of all superstition," and to send up to him at Lambeth "divers monuments of

¹ Cranmer's *Works*, i., 353, 354, 362, 422.

superstition,” consisting of Mass and other liturgical books.¹

Parker himself had suffered much vexation as to the sort of Communion bread which was to be used. The Queen’s injunctions in 1559 had specified “singing cake”. This to many seemed to flavour of the Mass. “If superstition be feared in the wafer-bread, they may have Communion in fine usual bread,” suggested Parker, though the matter was not “greatly material,” and could be determined by “her highness and Cecil”. His own order, for which he professed no value, was wafer-bread, but judging from an incident he describes, it occasionally met with open contempt. Upon Passion Sunday (it was no longer called Passion) of the year 1566, “the table being made ready for divers communicants, a man of the parish drew therefrom both cup and wafer-bread, because the bread was not common, and so the people were disappointed”.²

“The Mass is abolished,” wrote Parkhurst to Bullinger, 1559, and the “Mass-mongers” are sadly annoyed at the Pope’s being cast out.³ The intelligence is corroborated, and the exultation shared by Grindal and Jewell.

“The Mass has never been more highly prized within my memory,” wrote Jewell facetiously, “it costs every spectator two hundred crowns.” “No

¹ Parker’s *Correspondence*, pp. 296, 297.

² Parker to Cecil, 1566. *Correspondence*.
Zurich Letters, First Series, pp. 29, 31.

one can say Mass without paying a very heavy fine.”

The “Jewel” of the Church,¹ as he was called by men who hated the Mass, and Bishop Pilkington of Durham, distinguished themselves by specially irreverent language. The wall of separation between them and the hated Papists is constituted by the Mass. In his *View of a Seditious Bull*, Jewell admitted that the Pope was right in one point, and perhaps only one: “The Mass is indeed abolished through the gracious working of God”². Writing to Peter Martyr, he applied to the Mass the words:—

Qui bibit inde furit; procul hinc discedite mentis
Queis est cura bona.

“The whole of their religion (*i.e.*, the Papists) is contained in private Masses, mutilated Communions, and the natural and real presence or Transubstantiation.”³

“Alas, poor Mass,” exclaims Bishop Pilkington, “that has no better a groundwork to be built on than false lies;” and he solemnly thanks God “Who has delivered us from their continual Massing aforenoon, and Who of His undeserved goodness has overthrown the sacrifice of the Mass”⁴.

The troubles of Scotland fostered by Elizabeth were hailed by these men, who joined hands both

¹ “Re gemma fuit, nomine gemma fuit,” *Nugae Antiquae*, p. 12.

² *Works*, iv., 1139.

³ “Qui bibit inde furit,” *Zurich Letters*, First Series, pp. 14, 147.

⁴ Pilkington, *Burning of Paul's*, pp. 495, 528, 547.

with Zwinglians in Switzerland and Calvinists in the sister kingdom. The Regent, Murray, cast the Archbishop of St. Andrews into prison for saying Mass. He was condemned to death for the offence, but the sentence seems not to have been executed.¹

At the time of James VI.'s birth Bishop Parkhurst discussed with Bullinger his chances of a Catholic baptism. "The people of Edinburgh," he remarked, "would rather die than suffer the detested Mass to insinuate itself again into their churches."²

Whatever the Scotch thought on the subject, there was, at least, no ambiguity in the Anglican Hierarchy. In giving Bullinger an account of how "true religion" was established in Scotland, Grindal (1567) expressed himself in these words: "The Mass is abolished as being an accursed abomination, and a diabolical profanation of the Lord's Supper".³

Alone of his brethren, Bishop Cheney of Gloucester maintained "Luther's opinion respecting the Eucharist," that is, probably, Consubstantiation opposed to Transubstantiation. Bishop Cheney was honoured by the friendship of Edmund Campion, and there are some grounds for supposing that he may have been reconciled to the Church at the last.⁴ The question, however, is very obscure. His known views on the Holy Eucharist were thus

¹ *Zurich Letters*, p. 132. ² *Ibid.*, p. 147. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

⁴ See Simpson's *Life of Edmund Campion*.

commented on by Jewell (1567): “This cross will not, I hope, be of long continuance”.¹

A paper drawn up by Humphrey and Sampson about this time (1566) pointed out to Bullinger “some blemishes which still attach to the Church of England”. The writers would doubtless have included Bishop Cheney.²

“1. In the public prayers, although there is nothing impure, there is, however, a kind of Popish superstition, which may not only be seen in the morning and evening service, but also in the Lord’s Supper.

“2. In addition to the exquisite singing in parts, the use of organs is becoming more general in the churches.

“3. In the administration of baptism the minister addresses the infant; in whose name the sponsors, in the absence of the parent, make answer concerning faith, and renouncing the world, flesh, and the devil. The person baptised is signed with the (sign of the) cross.

“4. Licence is also given to women to baptise in private houses.

“5. The sacred habits, namely, the cope and sur-

¹ *Zurich Letters*, First Series, p. 147.

² Sampson was a popular preacher. Writing to Peter Martyr in January, 1560, he mentions Parker’s consecration, and says of some others: “They are soon, as I hear, to be consecrated, as we call it. . . . Let others be made bishops; as to myself, I will either undertake the office of a preacher only, or none at all.” *Zurich Letters*, First Series, p. 63.

pliance, are used at the Lord's Supper; kneeling is enjoined to those who communicate, and an unleavened cake is substituted for common bread.

“6. The Popish habits are ordered to be worn out of church, and by ministers in general; and the bishops wear their linen garment, which they call a *rochet*, while both parties wear the square cap, tippets, and long gowns, borrowed from the Papists.

“7. But what shall we say respecting discipline, the sinews of religion? There is none at all, neither has our Church its rod, or any exercise of superintendence.

“8. The marriage of the clergy is not allowed and sanctioned by the public laws of the kingdom, but their children are by some persons regarded as illegitimate.

“9. Solemn betrothing takes place after the Popish method and rites, by the (giving of a) ring.

“10. Women continue to wear a veil when they come to be churched.

“11. In the ecclesiastical regimen there are retained many traces of the Church of antichrist. For, as formerly at Rome everything might be had for money in the court of the Pope, so almost all things are saleable in the court of the metropolitan; ¹ pluralities of benefices, licences of non-residence, for not entering into orders, for eating meat on days

¹ A scale of charges is given in Strype's *Life of Archbishop Grindal*, p. 542.

forbidden, and in Lent, at which times also it is forbidden to celebrate marriages without a dispensation and a fee.

“12. The free liberty of preaching is taken away from the ministers of Christ, those who are now willing to preach are forbidden to recommend any innovation with regard to rites ; but all are obliged to give their assent to ceremonies by subscribing their hands.

“13. Lastly, the article composed in the time of Edward VI. respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the real presence in the Eucharist, and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect.”¹

The Hierarchy called into being by Queen Elizabeth stands as follows :—

Matthew Parker, - - -	1559	Archbishop of Canterbury.
Thomas Young, translated from St. David's,	1561	„ „ York.
William Barlow, - - -	1559	Bishop of Chichester.
Robert Horn, - - -	1561	„ „ Winchester.
Edmund Guest, - - -	1560	„ „ Rochester.
Edmund Grindal,	1559	„ „ London.
Edwin Sandys,	1559	„ „ Worcester.
Richard Cox,	1559	„ „ Ely.
Gilbert Barkley,	1560	„ „ Bath and Wells.
Thomas Bentham,	1560	„ „ Coventry and Lichfield.
William Alley,	1560	„ „ Exeter.
Edmund Scambler,	1561	„ „ Peterboro'.

¹ *Zurich Letters*, First Series, p. 163.

Hugh Curwen, - - -	1567	Bishop of Oxford.
John Scory, - - -	1559	„ „ Hereford.
Richard Davyes, - - -	1560	„ „ St. Asaph.
Thomas Young, - - -	1560	„ „ St. David's.
Roland Merick, - - -	1559	„ „ Bangor.
Richard Cheney, - - -	1562	„ „ Gloucester and com- mendatarius of Bristol.
John Jewell, - - -	1559	„ „ Salisbury.
James Pilkington, - -	1560	„ „ Durham.
Nicholas Bullingham, -	1560	„ „ Lincoln.
John Parkhurst, - - -	1560	„ „ Norwich.
John Best, - - -	1561	„ „ Carlisle.
William Downham, - -	1561	„ „ Chester. ¹

Each member of this Hierarchy took the following Oath of Allegiance and Homage, kneeling at the feet of Elizabeth.

“I doctor of divinity, now elect
of do utterly testify and declare in my
conscience that the Queen's highness is the only
supreme governor of this realm and of all other her
highness' dominions and countries, as well in all
spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as tem-
poral, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate,
state or potentate hath or ought to have any
jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or
authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this
realm. And further I acknowledge and confess to

¹ Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, the only Catholic bishop who kept his see by taking the Oath of Supremacy, is not included in this list. He died in 1563. Hugh Jones was appointed first Anglican Bishop of Llandaff, in 1566. Godwin, *De Praesulibus Angliae*.

have and to hold the said of and
the possessions of the same entirely, as well the
spiritualities as temporalities thereof, only of your
majesty and crown royal of this your realm ; and
for the said possessions I do mine homage presently
unto your highness, and to the same your heirs
and lawful successors, shall be faithful and true :
so help me God and by the contents of this
book.”¹

The Oath of Supremacy was the battlefield of the Catholic Hierarchy. They rightly considered it a betrayal of God and of their conscience, and rather than take it preferred Elizabeth's sentence of confinement or imprisonment. Only one bishop, Goldwell of St. Asaph, escaped the Queen's displeasure by a timely flight. Pate of Worcester, and Scott of Chester, ultimately managed to leave England, after they had been severely imprisoned, Pate for three years in the Tower, and Scott for

¹ The form of the Queen's *congé d'élire* for the election of a bishop. “Regina, etc., dilectis nobis decano et capitulo ecclesiae nostræ cathedralis salutem. Cum ecclesia nostra cathedralis prædicta per legitimam inde remotionem ultimi episcopi ibidem jam sit pastoris solatio destituta. Nos alium vobis eligendi in episcopum et pastorem licentiam per præsentes duximus concedendam, mandantes quod talem vobis eligatis in episcopum et pastorem, qui sacrarum literarum cognitione ad id munus aptus, Deo devotus, nobisque et regno nostro utilis et fidelis ecclesiae æque que prædictæ necessarius existat.

“In ejus rei, etc.

“Teste Regina apud Westmonasterium xviii. die Julii 1559.”
Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, pp. 242, 247.

four years in the Fleet. Imprisonment was at that time an illegal punishment for refusal of the Oath.

In May, 1560, Elizabeth's commissioners issued arrests against the whole number of deprived bishops then in England with the single exception of Poole of Peterboro'. They were eight, Dr. White of Winchester having died in January, 1560: Heath, Archbishop of York; Bourne of Bath and Wells, Thirlby of Ely, Watson of Lincoln, Turberville of Exeter, Pate of Worcester, Scott of Chester, and Bonner of London. Scott was confined for four years in the Fleet, Bonner till the end of his life in the Marshalsea. Of the remaining six in the Tower, Archbishop Heath and Bishop Turberville were allowed a restricted liberty, Bishop Pate escaped, and three were afterwards quartered on Anglican bishops. A worse spiritual crucifixion for a Catholic bishop could not well be imagined. The desolation and privations of the Tower were to some extent preferable to being brought face to face with heresy installed in the old strongholds of faith. Still imprisonment in the Tower or in any state prison at that time offered suffering enough to break the strongest spirit. "Educated, learned, distinguished men were deprived of their liberty, of social intercourse, of correspondence, of books, and of all the external consolations of religion, and in the vigour of their life condemned to drag out weary, purposeless days and nights for years, and that for no crime, by no law, at the caprice of a woman whom they

had helped to place on the throne. But they had not that limited freedom or 'free custody' which historians seem to think so delightful. They were kept 'close and severally,' *i.e.*, in separate cells, and without even solitary exercise." The separate cells meant meals apart. "Though waited on by their own servants, both masters and servants had to board themselves, and that too at exorbitant price."¹ They were not allowed Catholic worship, and their lives were threatened for persistent refusal of the Anglican Communion and the Oath of Supremacy.

In 1563 the six bishops in the Tower were released, and then began for three of them the saddest of all captivities. Bishop Bourne of Bath and Wells was transferred to the keeping of Bullingham, the Queen's bishop at Lincoln : Dr. Watson of Lincoln to Cox of Ely, and Dr. Thirlby of Ely to Parker.²

Comparatively little is known of what befel Dr. Bourne, but he no doubt shared the spiritual privations of Drs. Thirlby and Watson, together with their rigorous confinement. Thirlby remained for seven long years with Archbishop Parker, seven long years without confession and Mass; he was therefore protesting all the time against the worth of Anglican Orders. He died in 1570 without a single Catholic rite or sacrament.

Bishop Tunstall had likewise died in the custody of Parker, then archbishop-elect (1559).

Dr. Watson experienced several Anglican keepers,

¹ Fr. Bridgett, p. 40.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 42-44.

Cox of Ely, Grindal when Bishop of London, and Horn of Winchester. Some may have had more natural kindness than others. Dr. Parker, for instance, made a more compassionate jailer than Dr. Horn. One and all, however, they obeyed the Council's directions in their treatment of these prisoners for conscience' sake. The "code of discipline" did not leave much scope for good nature even where it existed. The orders were: "That the lodging be in such convenient part of your house, as he may be both there in sure custody, and also have no free access of your household people unto him, other than such as you shall appoint and know to be settled in religion and honesty, as that they may not be perverted in religion or any otherwise corrupted by him.

"That he be not admitted unto your table, except upon some good occasion to have ministered to him there in that presence, of some that shall happen to resort unto you, such talk whereby the hearers may be confirmed in the truth ; but to have his diet by himself alone in his chamber, and that in no superfluity, but after the spare manner of scholars' commons."

None to have access to him except his attendants, none to discuss religion with him except in presence of his custodian.

"That he have ministered unto him such books of learned men and sound writers in divinity as you are able to lend him, and none other.

“ That he have no liberty to walk abroad to take the air, but when yourself is at best leisure to go with him, or accompanied with such as you shall appoint.

“ That you do your endeavour by all good persuasions to bring him to the hearing of sermons and other exercises of religion in your house, and the chapel or church which you most commonly frequent.¹

One by one these valiant confessors departed to their reward, leaving their beloved churches in heretical hands, and an unwritten epitaph over their obscure tombs, *the holy places are come into the hands of strangers: her temple is become as a man without honour* (1 Mach. ii.).

¹ *Queen Elizabeth and the Catholic Hierarchy*, p. 91.

CHAPTER VIII.

ELIZABETH AFTER EXCOMMUNICATION.— A.D. 1570-1588.

ON the morning of 25th May, 1570, St. Pius V.'s Bull of Excommunication against Queen Elizabeth appeared on the walls of Grindal's palace in London. It might have proved the instrument of peace the Sovereign Pontiff meant it to be, if the situation in England had been less complex. What made Catholics as well as Protestants rally round Elizabeth was national feeling. It was this which strengthened her cause at every crisis of her career, and offered some kind of apology in the popular mind for her blackest misdeeds. Time had passed, and Catholics had seen for themselves that nothing was likely to happen. Mary Stuart, the heiress presumptive, was Queen of Scotland, and for one year she had been Queen of France, both her kingdoms being the sworn enemies of England. A few looked to Philip of Spain as a possible King of England: to many he appeared as a champion who would retrieve Catholic fortunes when at the worst. Ten long years of penal enactments against the Catholic religion had done their work, and bred discontent and indignation where before all was

(188)

loyalty. Pius V. grounded his excommunication on two points: (1) Elizabeth, illegitimate by birth, had no true title; and (2) she was a heretic and a persecutor of the Catholic religion. The Pope stated the case in the following words of his bull, *Regnans in excelsis* :—

“ She (Elizabeth), the pretended Queen of England, has forbidden by the strong hand of power the observance of the true religion, overturned by the apostate Henry VIII., and by the help of the Holy See restored by Mary the lawful queen of illustrious memory. She has followed after and accepted the errors of heretics. She has driven the English nobles out of the Royal Council, and filled their places with obscure heretics. She has been the ruin of those who profess the Catholic faith, and has brought back again the wicked preachers and ministers of impieties. She has done away with the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Divine Office, fasting, the distinction of meats, celibacy, and the Catholic rites. She has ordered the use of books, containing manifest heresy, throughout the realm, and the observance by her subjects of impious mysteries and ordinances, according to the rule of Calvin, accepted and practised by herself. She has dared to take away their churches and benefices from the bishops, the parish priests, and other Catholic ecclesiastics, and has given them with other ecclesiastical goods to heretics. She has made herself a judge in ecclesiastical causes. She has forbidden the prelates, clergy, and people

to acknowledge the Church of Rome, or to obey its mandates and the Catholic constitutions. She has compelled many to take an oath to observe her wicked laws, to renounce the authority of the Roman Pontiff, to refuse to obey him, and to accept her as the sole ruler in temporal and spiritual matters. She has decreed pains and penalties against those who do not submit to her, and has inflicted them upon those who continue in the unity of the faith and obedience.

“She has thrown Catholic prelates and parish priests into prison, where many, worn out by sorrows and their protracted sufferings, have ended their days in misery.”¹

The Holy Father, as the Vicar of Christ, released from their allegiance subjects who could not be faithful to it without being faithless to God. Moreover he declared that those who should continue to treat Elizabeth as their queen were included in the same excommunication. Catholics in England were thus placed between two fires, but the Pope counted on an unresponsive Christendom, and as a matter of fact his excommunication was never materially carried into effect. He did not contemplate the impossible situation which ensued: subjects unbound by their spiritual Head yet held to an outward allegiance by the law of the land.

The Bull was the signal for war to the knife against the Catholic religion. Hitherto the Queen

¹ *The Church under Elizabeth*, i., 192.

had proceeded by penal laws so framed as to sap the courage of all except the bravest. Sometimes men had proved themselves kinder than the law and had suffered it not to be applied to Recusants in its extreme rigour. Mercy was now no more. In the first place, sentence was executed on the publisher of the Bull. John Felton at the risk of his life had affixed the papal document to the walls of Grindal's palace.¹ He suffered a traitor's death in August, 1570, and is among our beatified martyrs. Elizabeth, he said in his last moments, was no longer his queen, nevertheless he drew a magnificent diamond ring from his finger, as a gift to her, and a testimony that he was free from personal grudge.

Parliament (April, 1571) proceeded to enact that "if any person, after the first day of July next coming, shall use or put in use in any place within the realm any bull, writing or instrument obtained or gotten . . . from the Bishop of Rome . . . he shall suffer pains of death, and also lose and forfeit all his lands, tenements and hereditaments, goods and chattels". Next, "if any person after the same 1st July shall take upon him to *absolve or reconcile* any person . . . or if any shall willingly *receive and take any such absolution or reconciliation* he should be subject to the same penalties.

¹ In modern times his act was emulated by Mencacci, who equally risked his life to publish Pius VII.'s Bull of Excommunication against Napoleon I.

Furthermore, any person bringing into the realm any tokens, crosses, pictures, beads, from the Bishop or See of Rome, and delivering the same to any subject, should incur the penalties of *Præmunire*." Both bringer and receiver fell under the Statute.¹ By law, therefore, the priest had no longer standing ground in England. He could lead only a hunted existence, in disguise or hiding-place, liable at any moment to be assaulted by pursuivant, or betrayed by spy.

The Northern Rising had precipitated matters in Yorkshire, and signal severity had been exercised on the "Mass priests" by Cecil's express order. Thomas Plumtree, the first priest put to death for religion under Elizabeth, suffered in 1570. His name headed a list of sixty-six condemned at Durham for their implication in the Rising.² The Council of the North was an abiding terror to Catholics. The Pilgrimage of Grace under Henry had called it into existence "for the better administration of the northern counties". In course of time, it became an inquisitorial tribunal for the denunciation of Popish Recusants, and its records if published would reveal "one of the bloodiest chapters in English history".³ The president of this council held his court at St. Mary's Abbey, York,

¹ Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, Third Parliament, p. 57. Jessop, *One Generation of a Norfolk House*, p. 65.

² Spillmann, p. 95.

³ Jessop, p. 223.

and in 1572 the Earl of Huntingdon was nominated to the office. A staunch Puritan, he countenanced a system of espionage and a regular band of informers who grew rich by denouncing the Recusant Yorkshire gentry. Cecil was kept accurately informed as to the religious views of the county families thus closely watched. The reproach of fortune-making by this ignoble process does not rest on Lord Huntingdon himself, although he sanctioned it in others, but Sandys, Archbishop of York, in 1575, had a keen eye to spoils. The fine of twenty pounds a month for non-attendance at the Protestant service was exacted without mercy, and those unable to pay it were thrown into York Castle and kept at their own charges. The country gentleman, no less than the priest, spent his life in hiding. He could no longer stay in his own house to await certain ruin. The system of relentless fines threw a crowd of well-bred paupers on the country or on any relations that were not themselves impoverished. The ministers of the new religion were no better than it, and yet were found with great difficulty. They were for the most part “ignorant ranters utterly unfit to cope with the trained dialecticians who were being reared so carefully beyond the seas ”.¹

“The trained dialecticians ” enjoyed an education which was not easily acquired in England under Elizabeth, when the whole number of schools

¹ Jessop, p. 74.

scarcely reached 200. The Queen's labours as Supreme Governess were detrimental to the cause of education, and it followed as a natural consequence that her government was more occupied with Catholic and Puritan than in patronising learning. The adage "each man for himself" was apparent in the school system, or rather in the want of it. No general plan was adopted. All was chaotic, and left to the individual. Elizabeth founded twenty-two grammar-schools. More are ascribed to her, but it is certain that she founded them, so to say, with a sparing hand, and with none of the prodigality she lavished on favourites, and on spies at home and abroad.¹ The cause of learning did not gain from the exile imposed upon its best representatives. Allen and Campion amongst a crowd of others were obliged to leave England, merely because they were Catholics. Penal laws had not yet robbed Catholics of their intellectual supremacy, but it must have been clear to the Queen that no intellect could in the long run resist the decadence of persecuting and proscriptive laws. If prison garments are only worn long enough, they produce prison dirt and prison apathy which make the discharged convict easily recognised.

Thomas Woodhouse, a Lincolnshire rector, and one of Queen Mary's clergy, was the first priest

¹ Zimmermann, *England's Oeffentliche Schulen von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, p. 31.

executed for high treason, *viz.*, for the crime of his priesthood alone, at a time of peace.

The Northern Rising had entailed signal vengeance on priests who had taken part in it, and thus served as a pretext for the strongest measures, but in 1573 the Catholic faith itself was the crime. After years of imprisonment, imposed for the rejection of Elizabeth's supremacy, Thomas Woodhouse was at length put to death at Tyburn with the usual barbarities, June, 1573. He was no ordinary man. Gentleness and fortitude moulded his spiritual being. He found means to say Mass every day in his prison, and, what was perhaps equally difficult, he delivered his mind to Cecil on the subject of the Royal Supremacy, adjuring him to recognise the Holy See once more.¹ The request was equivalent to his death warrant.

The following year, 1574, Alban Dolman, Oliver Heywood, Thomas Heywood and John Cooper, priests, were taken prisoners whilst saying Mass at various private houses in London. Hearing Mass was also a penal act, and many of the assistants were likewise hurried off to imprisonment. All these persons had to answer before the law for this crime and were condemned according to the Statute. The Bishops of London and Ely, appointed to judge those who had been in Lady Carey's house when Mass was said, suggested that the priest should be tortured and so led to reveal the names of all the

¹ *Die Englischen Martyrer*, p. 96.

assistants.¹ These were among the first of those terrible domiciliary visits which Catholics had to expect at any hour of the day or night. The blood-hounds of the law in the Queen's name would soon have hunted down the old clergy, as Queen Mary's priests were called. The Douai priests were now in a position to supply the ranks and to enter on the English mission. Not an hour had been lost since the foundation of the Seminary in 1568. The first missionaries came to England just in the nick of time, and within ten years of its birth the Seminary had its protomartyr in the person of Cuthbert Maine. A Devonshire man, he began his career by taking Anglican orders at the solicitation of an uncle who had himself fallen away from the faith. Conversion, vocation to the priesthood, which then necessitated a training beyond the seas, and return to England, followed in the next few years. His labours in the English vineyard were cut short by his apprehension at Golden in Cornwall, the house of Mr. Francis Tregian. Golden was pointed out to the Bishop of Exeter as "a nest of Recusants," in which it was probable that a priest was lurking. The priest in question was Cuthbert Maine, who in the disguise of a bailiff, was ministering to the needs of souls. An *Agnus Dei* was discovered upon him, which was sufficient warrant for his apprehension. The six charges against him prove him to have been devoted to the Holy See, the source and centre of

¹ *Die Englischen Martyrer*, p. 94.

Orders and Jurisdiction. The Act of Parliament which made the reception of a papal Bull high treason, was in fact aimed against the priesthood itself. Cuthbert Maine passed the last night of his life standing in a large assembly of county notables and preachers, explaining the “faith that was in him”. He was invited to save himself from a traitor’s death by at least recognising the Queen’s spiritual supremacy in England.

“The Queen never was, nor is, nor can be the head of the Church in England,” was his reply. Consequently, on the morrow, 30th November, 1577, he was hanged, drawn, and quartered at Launceston, the first of the heroic Seminary priests to shed his blood.

His host, Francis Tregian, was associated with him in suffering, if not in death. Rich, handsome and noble, he sacrificed all his natural gifts in the service of the Catholic cause. Fines and *Præmunire* robbed him of his large fortune, whilst health, strength and youth passed away in an imprisonment lasting twenty-eight years. After Francis Tregian’s arrest with Cuthbert Maine, the officials went back to Golden and thrust his wife, who had retired for the night, and was expecting her confinement, out of doors, a homeless wanderer, with helpless little children. Mrs. Tregian was worthy of her husband, whose prison she shared to some extent. She became the mother of eighteen children, thus deprived of house and home. The brave spirit

of Francis Tregian never failed, but his naturally strong constitution broke down under prison hardships. He became sick unto death, and then rallied "to suffer or die" through the weary years. Under James I. he was at length set free, and found his way to Lisbon. He died there in the odour of sanctity, and his body was discovered incorrupt after seventeen years. He had borne "twenty-eight years of imprisonment for the Holy Faith,"¹ says the Portuguese inscription at the English College. All his merits, however, were not written on his tomb. His troubles arose in the first instance from resisting the Queen's advances.² Thus he was doubly a martyr. The names of Cuthbert Maine and of Francis Tregian are inseparably linked together; the one gave his blood, and the other all that makes life precious.

Solitary confinement, even under the most favourable circumstances, tends to lower vitality, and consequently to deaden the faculties. State prisoners under Elizabeth had, however, to contend with every

¹ Morris, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, i., 62.

² "Aulam Elizabethæ adit, ingruente persecutio[n]e, ut Catholicis opem aliquam ferret, ducta jam in conjugem Maria Vicecomitis (Baronis) Sturtoniæ filia; Regina per pedissequam illum invitat ad cubiculum, intempesta nocte; recusantem adit, lectoque assistens ad impudica provocat; renuentem increpat. Castitati suæ curam gerens ex Aula se proripuit, insalutata Regina; quæ idcirco furit, et in carcerem detrudi jubet. Factum id 8 Jun., 1577." Stonyhurst MSS. Fr. Grené's *Collectan.*, quoted in *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, i., 63.

form of discomfort, when actual torture was not applied. They were thrust into filthy dens where life itself was a misery, weighted with heavy chains, or made prison associates of malefactors. Still, that age had other and more fearful resources wherewith to break a man's spirit than the deprivation of air and light, slow starvation, and permanent stench. The Tower possessed four different sorts of torture which were freely applied, not indeed to wring state secrets from unfortunate prisoners, but to make Catholic priests confess where they had said Mass, and Catholic laymen betray the outlawed priest, whom they had harboured. Torture and the spy system went hand in hand ; the one supported the other. The Tower officials of to-day point to these instruments as those used by the Spanish Inquisition.¹ The ordinary Englishman will credit any amount of falsehood rather than believe evil of his countrymen, so Cecil's atrocities are disguised by a tribunal which is popularly supposed to have no character to lose. These hideous devices consisted (1) in the rack, which was a large open frame of oak, raised three feet from the ground. The prisoner was laid under it, on his back, on the floor ; his wrists and ankles were attached by cords to two rollers at the ends of the frame. Sometimes the stretching caused bones to start from their sockets, and nerves were strained to their utmost point of

¹ Spillmann, *Die Englischen Martyrer*, p. 194.

endurance. Priests would be kept for hours on the rack. (2) The Scavenger's Daughter was a broad hoop of iron, consisting of two parts, fastened to each other by a hinge. The prisoner was made to kneel on the pavement, and to contract himself into as small a compass as he could. The suffering thus inflicted was by pressure, which often caused haemorrhage of internal organs. Blood would pour from nose or mouth. (3) Iron gauntlets which served to compress the wrists, and to suspend the prisoner in the air, from two distant points of a beam. He was placed on three pieces of wood, piled one on the other, which, when his hands had been made fast, were successively withdrawn from under his feet. It was an exquisite torture.¹ (4) Little Ease, which was a cell so narrow that the prisoner could neither walk, stand, lie, nor sit, but only crouch. "The Pit," an underground dungeon, twenty feet below the surface of the soil, was another abode of torture, from the total lack of air and light.²

The impulsion given by the Bull of Excommunication to the laws already existing lasted till 1579, when a new wave of severity, due to the combined exertions of the Pope and Dr. Allen, passed over Catholics in England. Every effort prompted by external zeal had the same result, stimulating

¹ See account of Fr. Gerard's torture from iron gauntlets in *One Generation of a Norfolk House*, p. 146.

² Spillmann, p. 193, and Lingard, viii., *Note G*, p. 423.

Elizabeth and her government to stronger measures. During this first decade of bitter persecution, even the wretched massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572) had told against the Recusants. Dr. Allen's zeal was not contented with one seminary, nor was he daunted by the martyrdom of Cuthbert Maine. He did not rest satisfied till he had founded a college in the heart of Christendom, under the eyes of the Sovereign Pontiff. Gregory XIII. entered warmly into his views. The Holy Father converted the hospice for English pilgrims and an adjacent house into a seminary, issued the charta of foundation at Christmas, 1578, and nominated Maurice Chenock as first rector.¹ Dissensions amongst the Welsh and the English led to the new seminary being placed in the hands of the Jesuits, a direction they retained until the suppression of the Society in 1773. Dr. Allen saw and acknowledged the excellence of the new Order though it took from him some of his most promising subjects. He went further. He pleaded the claims of the English mission with the Father General and succeeded in enlarging the missionary field. Differences arose later on between secular and regular, but Dr. Allen had no part in them. He worked for God's glory, and his one thought was to further it by all possible means. England, with its perils and labours of love for souls, was the spiritual prize set before the new Society, but St. Ignatius in his readiness

¹ Spillmann, p. 140.

to embrace suffering had bequeathed prudence to his sons. It was a grave responsibility for the Father General to send missionaries to the English slaughter-house, and he foresaw complications from the want of an organised Hierarchy. The Holy Father settled part of his difficulty by nominating Bishop Goldwell of St. Asaph's as the responsible head of the English mission. This step and Dr. Allen's eloquence won the day.

Gregory XIII., Dr. Allen and the Society of Jesus were the enemies of the hour, who called for Elizabeth's vigilance. This was plain in an Edict published in July, 1580. The Queen made a fierce attack upon the Seminaries supported by the Pope, and summoned her subjects to declare the names of those who were being educated beyond the seas without her special permission. The Seminarists were required to return within four months, or to suffer the severest penalties, together with her high displeasure. Any one who befriended "Jesuits, Seminarists, or Mass-mongers" was to be accounted a supporter of traitors, and to be punished with the utmost rigour of the law. This Edict was quickly followed by two more in the same sense. One road to the Queen's favour was to profess horror of Catholics, and several Anglican bishops distinguished themselves in this particular. The Bishop of Chester petitioned for new and severer laws against them. "All vagabond priests, going about in disguise, deceiving your Majesty's subjects, hold-

ing meetings," etc., should be declared traitors and treated as such without regard to their orders.¹

A memorandum by Cecil drawn up in July, 1580, first gave prominence to Wisbeach Castle as a prison for Catholics. From very early times a bishop's palace was used for the reception of State prisoners. The property of Wisbeach in Cambridgeshire was an old possession of the see of Ely. Cardinal Morton, Bishop of Ely, built, between 1478 and 1483, a new castle of brick, but his successors allowed it to become ruinous.² To Wisbeach the last representative in England of the old Hierarchy, Bishop Watson of Lincoln, was sent in 1580, as being "too conversant with the Roman emissaries," *viz.*, the Jesuits. The "deposed ecclesiastical Papists" formed a little community, full of peace and harmony, but in very strait imprisonment. They met only at meals, if then, and were deprived of their books. The Bishop had lost one eye in the Marshalsea, and was growing blind. He had also contracted ague and sciatica, which the damp fen climate of Wisbeach did not tend to heal, but he was exposed to a worse trial than physical sufferings, however severe. His jailers ventured to assault his virtue, and then threatened his resistance with blows. Later years witnessed other trials at Wisbeach. The Bishop, at least, departed in peace, worn out with twenty-

¹ Spillmann, p. 170.

² Morris, *Two Missionaries under Elizabeth*, p. 222.

five years of imprisonment, and not seeing in this world the fruits of his labours (1584).¹

The Jesuit mission under the charge of Fr. Parsons landed in England in June, 1580. To the Jesuit contingent composed of Frs. Campion and Cottam, and two lay brothers, were added Dr. Ely, John Hart, Frs. Sherwin, Kirby, Briscoe or Bruce, and Rishton, priests, together with Frs. Bromburg, Giblet, Kemp and Crane of Queen Mary's clergy. The venerable Dr. Goldwell and Dr. Morton were prevented by illness from reaching England.

From the first the Queen strove to identify the Jesuits with the national enemies of England. It was not probable that men who had given up all things to come to England to lay down their lives out of pure zeal for souls would be politicians. This, however, was the light in which the Queen portrayed them to her people. She feigned to imagine that they, who set so little store by human things, had come to ignite a sort of moral dynamite in their native land. Fr. Mercurian, the General of the Society, had laid his orders upon Frs. Parsons and Campion to use the utmost discretion and tact in all their dealings. They were to preserve a strict incognito and not to reveal their true character except for special reasons, nor were they by carrying forbidden articles or suspicious letters to run the risk of braving the statute.

¹ Bridgett, *Queen Elizabeth and the Catholic Hierarchy*, pp. 192-205.

“ They were so to comport themselves as to make it evident to all that the sole gain they desired was to gain souls. They were not to busy themselves with State matters, nor to write to Rome on political questions. They were not to speak against the Queen, nor to allow others to do so in their presence, except in the case of proved friends, and not then unless for the most stringent reasons.”¹

At Fr. Campion’s representation, the Bull of Pius V. was so far modified as to allow English Catholics to recognise Elizabeth for their queen “under present circumstances,” and both he and Fr. Parsons received from the Sovereign Pontiff the fullest extraordinary faculties, with power of imparting them to secular priests.²

Early in January, 1581, Parliament met with the avowed purpose of counteracting Jesuitical poison, which had presumably been working since the previous June. It now became high treason to induce any one to leave the Church of England and to become reconciled to the Catholic Church. (1) Absolution given or received similarly involved high treason for penitent and confessor. Any one failing to denounce confessor or penitent to justice within twenty days was guilty of misprision of treason. (2) A fine of 200 marks and a year’s imprisonment were the penalty for saying Mass, 100 marks and one year’s imprisonment for hearing it. (3) Absence from church carried with it a fine of twenty pounds

¹ Spillmann, p. 144.

² *Ibid.*, p. 154.

a month : absence for a whole year obliged the Recusant to find two securities " for his good behaviour " in £200 each. (4) Any man occupying the post of tutor or master in private families without licence of the ordinary (Anglican bishop) was condemned to a year's imprisonment : any one harbouring a teacher who did not attend the Anglican worship was to be fined ten pounds a month.¹

This was Elizabeth's answer to the Jesuit mission with all its aspirations. Between 1556 and 1580, some seventy Englishmen entered the Society of Jesus. Amongst them Edmund Campion, Fr. Cottam, William Weston, William Holt, Richard Storey and John Hawlett are pre-eminent.²

The men who met with this reception were certainly making it "evident to all that the sole gain they desired was to gain souls". In a few months Fr. Parsons and Fr. Campion had visited most of the English counties, and stayed on their road in any country house which contained as much as one Catholic. In a letter to his General, Fr. Parsons describes the persecution as the worst since the conversion of England. Men, women, and children were hurried into prison, and deprived even of daylight, whilst their possessions were confiscated for no other crime than the Catholic faith. All that they were asked to do was to attend the Anglican service. In some cases a yearly appear-

¹ Spillmann, p. 173, and Lingard, viii., p. 143.

² *Wilhelm, Kardinal Allen*, p. 69.

ance at church under protest would have sufficed. "Outward conformity" alone would satisfy the Queen and meet the exigencies of the Statute, but it was rightly viewed as an act of heresy.¹ On the same terms the Christian might have offered sacrifice to the idol. No doubt to many in his generation he was a political fanatic, who suffered righteously for his disloyalty to Cæsar.

At Oxford soon after Elizabeth's accession, Edmund Campion, then an Anglican, had harangued her and made his mark upon her mind. His conversion and his vocation had intensified his power of influence, and his brilliant gifts of mind and heart. The Queen considered him worth gaining, and this is the explanation of the singular interest she showed in him, and of the subtle temptation which she put in his way. She courted an apostasy which would have been so fruitful to her cause.

In June, 1581, Fr. Campion published his *Decem Rationes*. It was printed at Stonor Park, and more eagerly read than Catholic books are wont to be at the present moment. The full title ran: *Rationes Decem, quibus fretus certamen Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ ministris obtulit in causa fidei Edmundus Campianus*. Three weeks after the publication of a book which brought the light of faith to many, Fr. Campion was betrayed by a false friend and lodged in the Tower. "Little Ease" received him. A few days later he was taken to Lord Leicester's

¹ Spillmann, p. 180.

house and brought unexpectedly into the Queen's presence. She questioned him on his allegiance and on the right of the Sovereign Pontiff to depose her. Fr. Campion replied to her first question that he recognised her as his lawful queen; to the second that it was not for him to decide. He would render to her Majesty the things of Cæsar, and to God also that which is His. What else transpired at this momentous interview is not known.

On his return to the Tower, Fr. Campion was treated for five days with great kindness and consideration. At the price of apostasy he might have become Archbishop of Canterbury. Honour being put before him he chose the cross and the rack; the fearful alternative of Elizabeth's Council was inaugurated on St. Ignatius' Day, 31st July, 1581. "It would have been easier," Lord Hunsdon declared, "to tear his heart from his body than to torture a word of betrayal from his lips."¹

The "betrayal" in question concerned the houses in which he had said Mass, or the confessions he had heard. Later on, after an experience of the iron manacles, the jailer asked how he felt his hands. "Well," replied Fr. Campion, "because I do not feel them at all."²

Between his first racking and his execution on 1st December, Fr. Campion lived between life and death. His sentence was a foregone conclu-

¹ Spillmann, p. 222.

² *Ibid.*, p. 230.

sion, but how to carry it out with a show of justice baffled Elizabeth and her Council. At last he and his companions were brought in guilty of having taken part in a plot at Rheims and Rome. Not one of them was convicted of treasonable designs. Each suffered for his priesthood and for exercising it in England. On the same day, 1st December, 1581, the Roman Seminary, the Seminary at Rheims, and the Society of Jesus, were represented at Tyburn, in their protomartyrs, Fr. Sherwin, Fr. Briant,¹ and Fr. Campion. One and all they might have said with Fr. Campion: "If to be a Catholic only, if to be a perfect Catholic, be to be a traitor, then am I traitor". The crowd at Tyburn on that wintry day was singularly sympathetic. Fr. Campion's appearance, his words, his demeanour, all produced a deep impression, and something akin to enthusiasm. The hangman was not suffered to carry out Fr. Campion's sentence on a living body. As he cut off and threw a portion of it into the seething cauldron, some of the martyr's blood fell on one of the by-standers, young Henry Walpole, who was gazing, horrified yet fascinated, at the terrible scene. Protestant as he was, he felt from that moment an intense longing to become a Catholic and to carry on Fr. Campion's work. Fourteen years later, in 1595, he laid down his life at York for the Catholic faith, a priest and Jesuit, who faithfully

¹ Shortly before his death he entered the Society of Jesus.

walked in Fr. Campion's footsteps and shared his sufferings.¹

Treachery and all the forces of Walsingham's spy system were added to a penal legislation, which had not yet reached its climax of severity. The pretended plot at Rome and Rheims, in which Campion and his companions were accused of having taken part, was urged against them without further proof than the testimony of base spies who were well paid to make and substantiate their charges. The Jesuit, Fr. Cottam, and the Seminary priests, Frs. Kirby, Shert, Ford, Johnson, Filby and Richardson, were condemned with Fr. Campion, but their sentence was only carried out in May of the following year, 1582. Their prolonged life meant close imprisonment and the torture, and finally six articles were drawn up in the form of questions, which ran upon the Bull of Excommunication, and were so framed as to involve blame either on the Pope or on the Queen. They had been put in substance to Fr. Campion, who called them the "blood-thirsty questions".² The conviction of these holy priests was again a foregone conclusion, and they suffered in May, 1582. John Nichols, the wretched man who had borne false witness against the Seminaries, was lurking about the Tower at the time, tortured by remorse

¹ Spillmann, p. 274; Jessop, *One Generation of a Norfolk House*, p. 100.

² *Ibid.*, p. 284.

of conscience. He managed to attract the attention of Fr. Kirby, who in his prison cell was smarting from the lesser infliction of the "Scavenger's Daughter," and confessed his wickedness.¹ The real traitor was thus at large, betrayed by his own conscience. This Nichols was one of a large class who lived by inventing charges against the Pope, Cardinals, or Bishops. In a moment of remorse they would retract their stories, but the lie had done its work, and Walsingham dominated them by threatening prison and torture. John Nichols was expelled the Roman Seminary for immorality, and on his return to England was gladly employed by the government. He invented, mostly in the Tower, a thrilling narrative of horror against the Catholic Church, and then posed as a Catholic from whom the bitter truth was wrenched.² Yet John Nichols was not the worst instrument prepared in Walsingham's workshop. He might still be called an official pursuivant. The "pretended" pursuivants inspired even greater terror. Catholics were at the mercy of depraved ruffians who took out "counterfeit scutcheon and warrant,"³ to ruin them and despoil their homes. False brethren and apostate priests served Walsingham's purpose as no others could. Fr. Campion was betrayed by Elliot, a bad Catholic, and the unhappy Fr.

¹ Flanagan, *History of the Church in England*, ii., 230.

² *Ibid.*, ii., 229.

³ Morris, *Catholics of York under Elizabeth*, p. 19.

Ballard and Fr. Anthony Tyrrell contributed largely to the Babington Conspiracy. Whoever the tools, the sickening story was ever repeating itself; betrayal, false accusations, recantations, then in presence of the rack or torture, more charges made to order and persisted in till frightened conscience protested, too late to undo the impression created on the public mind.

In a social atmosphere, heavy with all kinds of vague rumours as to the treason of Recusants, it was easy to give severer penalties force of law. In 1585, Parliament enacted (1) "that all Jesuits, seminary priests and other priests whatsoever, made or ordained . . . by any authority . . . derived . . . from the See of Rome since 24th June, 1559, should within forty days depart out of this realm".

(2) Any Jesuit, seminary priest or other, so remaining after the same forty days should incur the offence of high treason and suffer its penalty. Any person aiding or receiving "such Jesuit or other" should be adjudged a felon, without benefit of clergy, and suffer death and forfeit as in case of felony.

(3) All English subjects at foreign Seminaries should return home within six months and take the oath of supremacy, or else be adjudged traitors and suffer as in case of high treason.

(4) After the same forty days no one should send their child or dependant "into the parts beyond the seas," except by special licence of her

Majesty or four of her Privy Council, upon pain to forfeit £100 for each offence.

(5) Any person after the same forty days concealing the knowledge of a Jesuit's or other priest's presence to be fined and imprisoned at the Queen's pleasure.¹

These enactments consummated the outlawry of the Catholic religion.

On the third reading of this Bill a certain Dr. Parry, who rose in the House to denounce it "as a measure savouring of treasons, full of blood, danger and despair to English subjects," was himself involved in their ruin. His antecedents were discreditable; he had been used as a spy, and yet had posed as a champion of the persecuted Catholics. He was lodged in the Tower on a charge of high treason, to which his speech in the House served as a handle. The usual confession and recantation followed. Neither served to avert the terrible sentence of death for high treason which, in his case, was carried out with special barbarity.²

The measure "full of blood" had now become the law of the land. Not only was a priest *ipso facto* a traitor, but any person receiving or harbouring him incurred the penalty of felony. This part of the statute fell with special severity on the weaker sex. English women could now emulate

¹ Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents, 1559-1625*, p. 27. Elizabeth, cap. ii., p. 83.

² Lingard, viii., 181.

those early Christians, who at the risk of their own lives had shown hospitality to confessors. This was the privilege of Margaret Clitheroe, who suffered a most cruel death at York in 1586 for harbouring two “traitors”. Margaret was born and bred in heresy, embracing the Catholic faith when she was about eighteen. It was a conversion of her whole being, which without the crown of martyrdom would have made her a saint. Her husband was a Protestant, who could reproach her only with her fondness for serving the servants of God. She was apprehended at last on the testimony of a boy, and advised to throw herself for trial on her country. Her chief crime had been the harbouring of priests, and this by the new law of England (1585) constituted felony. When once it was proved, she must have been sentenced to death, with or without trial. She steadfastly declined to be tried. Her refusal arose from her wish to avoid sin and scandal in others, but it exposed her to the penalty of those who would not plead, the *peine forte et dure* of being pressed to death.¹ The sentence

¹ “A statute of Edward I., cap. 12^o, anno 3^o, directs such persons as will not put themselves upon inquests of felonies before the judges at the suit of the King, to be put into hard and strong prison. . . . It appears by a record of Act 31 Edward III., that the prisoner might then possibly subsist for forty days under this lingering punishment. The practice of loading him with weights was gradually introduced between Act 31 Edward III. and Act 8 Henry IV., at which last period it appears in our books.” Morris, *Catholics of York under Elizabeth*, p. 438.

was carried out with inhuman cruelty and disregard to her situation¹ on 25th March, 1586, a fortnight from the time of her apprehension. The officials insisted that she should be stripped and laid on her back, with her hands and feet bound to posts. Margaret had provided a linen garment for herself, and this the women present at her execution were allowed to put on her, as a great concession. Then they laid heavy weights upon her, and a sharp stone under her back. Her agony was intense. Blood poured from under the door. Still the cry was, "Bring more stones". After a quarter of an hour the last words came from the martyr's gasping lips: "Jesu, Jesu, Jesu, have mercy on me". It was the double solemnity of Good Friday and the Annunciation. The mangled body was ignominiously cast into a dunghill, but six weeks later Catholics recovered it and buried it away with so much care that the place baffles discovery, and has remained a secret till this hour. One hand alone was cut off, and is still kept preciously at St. Mary's Convent, York, by the spiritual daughters of Mary Ward.² Numbers of women were imprisoned and tortured for their faith. "The Pearl of York" was one of the favoured three who suffered death. The other two were Margaret Ward, who, after being loaded with

¹ She was supposed to be pregnant.

² See account of Margaret Clitheroe by Fr. Mush, in *Catholics of York under Elizabeth*.

irons and scourged, was hanged in 1588, and Mrs. Anne Line, in 1601.

The year 1586 was marked also by the Babington Conspiracy, which paved the way for the tragedy at Fotheringay. When all the truth is known it will probably be shown to have been a widely reaching plot for the destruction of Mary Stuart. Babington and the priest Ballard were Walsingham's tools, who were easily swept away when he no longer needed them on a charge of having sought for Elizabeth's death. Their design was secondary to his own, which he was able to carry out through the treachery of Nau, Mary's secretary. Walsingham's gold corrupted the imprisoned Queen's confidential servants, and even now her memory is not wholly cleared from the hideous charges they thus dared to invent against her. Her private letters were tampered with, and the court summoned to try her, accepted the vague statements of Babington and Nau. Babington seems to have had a genuine feeling for Mary's wrongs, but he was reckless and imprudent. Making Mary a party to Babington's designs was a master-stroke of Walsingham's policy. In the tangled web of the Babington Conspiracy, the co-existence of two plots is sufficiently clear. The weakness and inaptitude of Mary's friends are in striking contrast to the iron will of Walsingham. They would have saved her, but he was determined upon her destruction, and the scheme against Elizabeth was a device to this end. Twelve of the

Babington conspirators were put to death as traitors, the Queen insisting that the executions should be “protracted to the extremitie of payne”¹ (September, 1586). As usual on these occasions the worst culprits escaped. The perfidious Nau was at large, whilst the toils he had helped to weave against his royal mistress were closing around her. The letter purporting to have been written by her to Babington was in fact her death warrant. It blackened her in the public mind and facilitated a condemnation which had been hanging over her head for many weary years. Archbishop Parker, who died in 1575, expressed his own desires on the subject to Cecil in no equivocal language: “If that only (one) desperate person (Queen Mary) were taken away, as by justice soon it might be, the Queen’s Majesty’s good subjects would be in better hope, and the Papists’ daily expectation vanquished”².

To the imprisoned, uncrowned Queen, a public trial and execution came almost as a favour from her cruel cousin, who would have rejoiced that an assassin should despatch her. Poulett, her keeper, was informed of Elizabeth’s wish, but stern man as he was, declined to act without an official death warrant. Mary’s last hours were full of peace and joy. Death had no horrors for one whose life had been a living death. Every spiritual consolation

¹ Lingard, viii., 216.

² Hon. C. Lindsay, *Mary, Queen of Scots*, p. 66.

was denied to Mary. She was not allowed even to see her confessor, who was actually at Fotheringay. The ministry of a priest was contrary to the law of the land and repugnant to the “restored Gospel”. The Queen, therefore, took the Earl of Kent’s words to her heart, as her *Viaticum*.

“Madam,” he said, after delivering the death warrant, “your life would have been the death of our New Religion, while your death—God grant it—will be its life.”¹

In her last prayer, Queen Mary made supplication for the afflicted Catholics in England, for her son, King James, and for her bitter enemy, Queen Elizabeth. Silence was heard as, at the third blow, Mary’s anointed head fell under the executioner’s axe, 8th February, 1587.²

Loyalty in Catholics outlived hope. The following year saw the defeat of the Invincible Armada, which had been in preparation since 1580. Philip of Spain personally had every reason to complain of Elizabeth, who had kept no memory of a time when she owed him liberty, if not life itself. Moreover, there were reasons why, as the most powerful sovereign in Christendom, he should proceed against her. Cardinal Allen in his *Admonition to English Catholics* set them forth in unambiguous, if somewhat coarse language. Dr. Allen became a cardinal in 1587, and

¹ Lee, *Church under Elizabeth*, ii., 158.

² See Miss Kinloch’s beautiful account of Mary Stuart’s execution, *History of the Church in Scotland*, ii.

headed the so-called Spanish party. He saw the real greatness of England humbled to the dust. Elizabeth's moral conduct was a scandal only equalled by her fierce persecution of Catholics. As Queen she had always justified de Quadra's complaint of setting Christendom on fire (*poner fuego en la Cristianidad*), and her treatment of Mary Stuart taken by itself deserved official chastisement. The offence of inflicting years of imprisonment is viewed by theologians as equivalent to murder.¹ The Cardinal was in perfect good faith when he called upon English Catholics to forward Philip's cause, yet the position was more intricate than he imagined. He overlooked the fact that Philip of Spain carried into his semi-religious campaign against Elizabeth personal designs which could not be acceptable to Englishmen. Sixtus V. was more clear-sighted. He distinguished Philip's religion from his policy, and whilst he blessed the banner in so far as it was directed against Elizabeth's irreligion, he was not a party to Philip's ambition.²

Elizabeth's strongest auxiliary remained, now as always, national feeling. At Tilbury it greeted her with enthusiasm when she in person reviewed the troops mustering under Lord Leicester. Catholics contributed vessels to Drake and Howard, and tenantry to the muster at Tilbury. The English fleet, commanded by Drake and Lord Howard of

¹ Bellesheim, *Wilhelm, Kardinal Allen*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 173.

Effingham, numbered only eighty ships against 130, and yet won a splendid victory. An ignominious retreat was forced upon what remained of the proud and Invincible Armada by the only course open, that of a circuit round the Orkneys. Its destruction was consummated by the storms of the northern seas.¹

Elizabeth's Catholic subjects warmly rejoiced in a triumph, which, as subsequent events proved, meant increased sufferings for themselves. Foreign Catholics, on the contrary, who in this matter were external to the national feeling, were grievously disappointed. The Armada made no exception to the rule, which visited all external efforts on behalf of the Catholic religion with increased severity.²

The last fourteen years of Elizabeth present, in fact, in an aggravated form all the evils which she had brought with her to the throne. Age did not diminish her passions either in private or in public life. The murder of Mary Stuart had not produced tranquillity, nor stemmed the tide of real or imaginary conspirators against her person. Prisons were crowded with Catholics whose religion her sanguinary laws had proscribed. The Church being relegated to the Catacombs, the Queen reigned over hearts and minds as far as she could. She had become the pivot on which life turned for churchman as well as courtier. Yet there was reason in Pilkington's old lament "that the poor Protestant, which has his

¹ Green, *History of the English People*, p. 411.

² Lingard, viii., 295.

liberty, lives in more misery, need, debt, reproach, and contempt than these Pope's prisoners, *who have lost all*. It is better in the world to be Pope's prisoner than Christ's preacher."¹ It is perhaps needless to add that Pilkington was not speaking in the spiritual sense of suffering as a gain. He was smarting from the Queen's appropriation of benefices. His words illustrate Elizabeth's scheme of drawing all things to herself.

¹ *Works*, "Burning of Paul's".

CHAPTER IX.

CHURCHES AND THE CHURCH.—A.D. 1588-1603.

WHILST Catholics were harassed, fined, proscribed, tortured, and put to death, what was the state of the churches from which they had been expelled? In the very year of the Armada (1588) the sentence of high treason was carried out on Margaret Ward for no other crime than harbouring priests, and in the autumn nine priests and ten laymen were executed for their Catholic faith. The Church was in the Catacombs: what had the Royal Supremacy made the churches? White-washed, despoiled, empty, they were closed from Sunday to Sunday, and displayed as their sole adornment the Royal Arms with a lion and a dog, or a representation of Elizabeth in place of crucifix or rood-screen. The fear of the Queen was literally “the iniciacion of wisdom,” as a courtier scribe at Cuxham in Oxfordshire had explained the text; hence the fact that whole thousands who preferred the biblical version, *viz.*, the fear of the Lord, “were left untaught”.¹

It may be at once premised that the destroyer of sacraments is likewise the destroyer of churches. Five were expunged from the State Establishment,

¹ *The Church under Queen Elizabeth*, ii., 224, 228.
(222)

Penance, Confirmation, Matrimony, Holy Orders, and Extreme Unction. The single invention of the English Reformers concerned Confirmation, which they maintained as a rite, though no longer a sacrament.¹ Archbishop Sandys publicly expressed his conviction that Extreme Unction was “a vain and filthy oiling by the Pope’s crew”.² The Order of Common Prayer recognised only two sacraments, but it is questionable whether Practice recognised any at all. Many raised what a grave historian³ calls a “frivolous objection” to the sign of the cross in baptism. “Some,” he says, “baptised in the font, others in a basin; some with the sign of the cross, others without it,” consequently did not lawfully baptise. The same laxity prevailed in the second sacrament.

Anglicanism, still in its cradle, gave a certain promise of dissolution by a twofold presence within its own bosom, that of Dissent and of Puritanism. As early as 1583 Robert Brown contended that its bare ordinances were superstitious and papistical and that “the Church of England was no true Church”. He too believed in the principle of Papacy, though he applied it wrongly, became a pope for himself and his followers, and founded the “Brownists”.⁴ Grindal, the second Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, patronised the “prophesyings,” uproarious meetings of a dissenting character, at

¹ Lee, i., 315.

² *Ibid.*, ii., 286.

³ Hallam, quoted by Collier, vii., 261.

⁴ Collier, vii., 2.

which the Bible was freely interpreted by the “prophets”. Indeed, the Bishops had a difficult part to play. Hating the Catholic Church, the fear was that they would openly fall into the snare of Puritanism. Secretly it expressed their own mind far more than the Queen’s *via media*.

Parker, the corner-stone under Elizabeth of the Anglican Hierarchy, set the example of receiving her pontifically whenever she visited Canterbury, and the Queen who was eradicating the *Ave Maria* from the hearts of her subjects had no objection to listen to *Ave Eliza*. Our Lady’s chief feasts were struck off the calendar, whilst the Queen’s birthday was added to it as a feast of the first class, equal to the greatest solemnities of the year. Archbishop Sandys, who had moved in Convocation the abolition of “all saints’ feasts and holy days bearing the name of a creature,” should at least have been consistent. At Cambridge in 1564, the Queen entered King’s College Chapel with pontifical honours. Four doctors of divinity carried over her a canopy of cloth of gold which had been used in Queen Mary’s reign for the most Blessed Sacrament. There, too, her praises were sung at Evensong in place of Our Lady’s ancient antiphon.¹

It is freely acknowledged that up to the year 1587 “numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination,” and those who had received orders

¹ *Church under Elizabeth*, i., 111, 125, 146.

otherwise than by the English Ordinal were allowed, on giving certain securities, to exercise their calling in England.¹ Indeed, the Establishment was constrained to suffer the ministrations of “ cobblers, weavers, tinkers, tanners, card-makers, tapsters, fiddlers, jailers,” in order to break her bread to the multitude. But the lack of life-giving bread explained the desolation of the churches. The ever-recurring complaint of Catholics stands on the prison registers: So and so “ cometh not to the church because there is neither priest, altar, nor Sacrifice ”.²

A quarterly administration of the Lord’s Supper was all the food which was offered to famishing souls. A plain deal board was set up on tressels in the body of the church, and removed after the rite to await the next quarter. Even a spiritual perception of Our Lord’s Presence was gone, and the grosser Protestants, who clamoured for a free interpretation of Scripture, urged the propriety of making the Supper a substantial evening meal. In many places towards the latter half of Elizabeth’s reign a cloth was spread, and bread and wine were liberally supplied. The tressels remained in use till 1625. The general rule was to administer “ the sacrament in the most irreverent manner ; the service for the altar was borrowed from the nearest house, and the

¹ *Church under Elizabeth*, ii., 208.

² Morris, *Catholics of York under Elizabeth*, p. 248.

communicants took their seats at tables which the Catholics termed 'oyster boards'.¹

"Nor did irreverence finish with the rite, for the residue" of the Sacrament (in loaf bread) "unreceived was taken of the priest or of the parish clerk, to spread their young children's butter thereupon, or to serve their own tooth with it at their homely table".²

Elizabeth's bishops noted the decay of religion, which they ascribed to the wrong cause. They could stand by and witness the ill-treatment offered to their meagre rites without uttering a protest, whilst a single offence against the Queen's spiritual supremacy wounded them in the apple of their eye. They were insensible to white-washed churches from which life and worship had departed, and more than this. Their Puritanical and Calvinistic souls gloried in the nakedness of God's house. Gold, silver, precious stones and human hearts were the Queen's. Still a man was found on the Anglican side who neither shared the views of his superiors nor imitated them in their dogmatical silence. Hooker was born in 1554, and brought up in Calvinism. He reasoned himself into Church principles, and grew to view the Anglican Establishment as if it had been the Catholic Church. Hooker became a country clergyman, or, as he would have called it, a presbyter. "The Holy Ghost," he says, "throughout the body of

¹ *Documents from Simancas*, quoted by Lee, ii., 203.

² Heylin, *Affairs of Church and State in England under Queen Elizabeth*, pp. 174, 175.

the New Testament, making so much mention of them (presbyters), doth not anywhere call them priests.”¹ Not only was he in favour of the word presbyter, but also of the thing signified by the office of presbyter opposed to that of the priest. He married a wife who did not make him happy, practised the Catholic virtues of humility and mortification, and in his unknown parish founded by his mind and by his pen a certain school of theology, or its shadow, in Anglicanism. Pope Clement VIII. commended his learning, and spoke of “the seeds of eternity” contained in his works. Hooker was in fact the father of those who apply Catholic principles to the State Establishment, and give theories the value of facts. The account of his last hours illustrates the strange inconsistency of his life, holy as it was. He confessed his sins to Dr. Saravia, whose ordination was doubtful, and received from him the Communion,² and this at a time when the Anglican Bench denounced confession, and tolerated shocking irreverence at the Lord’s Supper. Hooker was accomplishing an act of piety rather than a sacramental act.

If his eyes had been opened he might have recognised the testimony of those who were “stoned, cut asunder, tempted, put to death by the sword, who wandered about in sheep-skins, in goat-skins, being in want, distressed, afflicted”.

¹ *Times*, article of 20th October, 1894, anent Anglican Orders.

² *Church under Elizabeth*, ii., 205-209.

Elizabeth did not stone Catholics, except morally, but in all other particulars they fulfilled the Apostolical measure of suffering. The whole body fell under three categories.

(1) The clergy, that is, such seminary priests and regulars, chiefly Jesuits, Benedictines, and Franciscans of the Observance, who, risking their lives for the English mission, "wandered about in sheep-skins, in goat-skins," and were outlawed for no other crime than their priesthood. Many old priests, however, languished in prison. (2) The Catholic laity consisted of those at large, if they could be so termed, who, paying ruinous fines for non-attendance at church, yet managed to keep a home over their heads, to harbour priests, and to cheat the pursuivants. Every Catholic house of any note was entered on the register of the Privy Council and liable to be searched at any hour of day or night. One Dr. Vavasour, returning home in secret after a twenty years' banishment, was betrayed by a school-master. A search followed, during which naked swords were brandished about the house, "thrust and porred into every crevice," until Mrs. Vavasour's mind gave way with intense fear and anxiety for her husband. In her madness she betrayed many secrets. The following day Dr. Vavasour gave himself up.¹

If Catholics not actually imprisoned were so tor-

¹ *Catholics of York under Elizabeth.* "Notes of a prisoner in Ousebridge Kidcote," p. 299.

mented, what can be said of those who were? They constituted the third category. Life in the English Catacombs was a living death. In the notes of a prisoner, who was confined at Ousebridge Kidcote in York, it appears that all sorts and conditions of people were suffering a cruel captivity, which they might have ended at any moment by going to the Anglican church. Old priests had been there for a term of twenty, twenty-four, twenty-six, and twenty-eight years, as the case might be. Occasionally their courage failed and they lost the crown which was within reach. Thomas Bell, a priest, had spent twenty-four years at Ousebridge, enduring bitter cold, and much tribulation from the preachers. His spirit broke. From priest he became a spy. Mrs. Vavasour, Mary Hutton and Alice Ouldeorne after seven years' imprisonment were shut up one winter's night in an underground dungeon where they took their death of cold, and all died in three days.¹ Low, dark and filthy dungeons tried the physical man, and very often the company of the worst criminals added moral torture. It would almost seem that the missionary found greater scope for his zeal in the genuine prison than in hiding-place. He could not walk abroad in his true character, and however he disguised himself his steps were dogged by government spies or pursuivants, greedy for booty. Many who languished in Eliza-

¹ *Catholics of York under Elizabeth.* "Notes of a prisoner in Ousebridge Kidcote," p. 302.

beth's dungeons, whether for conscience or otherwise, were strengthened by the apostolate of priests devoted to the work of prisons.

Fr. Buckley, afterwards a Franciscan Observant and a martyr (1598), during the three years he passed in the Marshalsea from 1583, laboured unceasingly for his fellow-prisoners, preparing their happiness and his own crown. The Franciscan spirit of self-sacrifice was never allowed to die out, and all through the worst times of persecution, the seal of the Observant Province was handed from martyr to confessor. The name of Genings is associated with its revival later on. Fr. Edmund Genings died heroically in 1591, being apprehended in the treasonable act of saying Mass. He was one of those who endured all the pangs of the terrible sentence. Only slightly stunned when cut down, he was perfectly conscious through the agonising butchery. While his heart was in the executioner's hand he is said to have uttered the words, *Sancte Gregori, ora pro me.* The hangman, dead to pity, exclaimed with an oath: "See, his heart is in my hand, and yet Gregory is in his mouth".¹

Ten days later his brother John was suddenly converted from a life of sin, and subsequently took the Franciscan habit. Fr. Edmund's blood had pleaded for him with God.

To Fr. Parsons' zeal was due the foundation of the English Seminary at Valladolid in 1589 and

¹ Mrs. Hope, *Franciscan Martyrs in England*, p. 103.

that of St. Omer in 1593, the year preceding the death of Cardinal Allen. The great work of William Allen thus took vigorous root before he went to his reward. “Corporate reunion” with the heart and centre of Christendom had been his dream. Instead of its accomplishment he had the privilege of training martyrs for the English battlefield. The statute of 27th Elizabeth left, it would seem, little more for penal laws to destroy, and in fact the later legislation did not add very materially to the misery of Catholics. But the instincts of men had become brutalised by the frequent gallows, cauldron and butchering board. The horrible sentence of high treason, as executed by law on a living body, was no longer sufficient. Torture was prolonged and repeated till it almost passed the bounds of human endurance. To what had England descended when Topcliffe, the priest hunter, was allowed full control over the bodies of his victims? Even the Tower instruments fell short, and he would remove such as were committed to him to his own house in order to superintend their suffering.

Fr. Robert Southwell, the Jesuit, landed in England with Fr. Garnet in 1586, and this in itself was an act of high treason. A hiding-place in the house of the Countess of Arundel and Surrey served him as head-quarters till 1592. He was betrayed at last by an unfortunate girl whom Topcliffe ruined, conveyed to Topcliffe’s house, and made to suffer torture worse than death. The man was of adamant,

and his words only those of praise and thanksgiving. “God gave Himself to thee, do thou give thyself to Him,” was ever in his mouth (*Deus tibi Se, tu te Illi*). Topcliffe’s warrant for the torture, which he so freely applied, was issued by the Privy Council, and Cecil himself expressed his admiration at Fr. Southwell’s fortitude. “Antiquity boasts of its Roman heroes,” he said, “and the patience of the captives under their tortures. Our own time is not inferior to theirs, nor does English courage yield to Roman. We have now in our hands one Southwell, a Jesuit, who, having been thirteen times most cruelly tortured, could be induced to confess nothing.”¹

At the urgent request of Mr. Southwell that his son should be treated as a gentleman, or else executed, Fr. Southwell was removed first to the Gatehouse, and then to the Tower, where he lingered in captivity for thirty months. He was hanged, drawn, and quartered on 21st February, 1595, and so consummated the gift of himself to God. His friend, the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, succumbed a few months later, after an imprisonment of ten years. There is some ground for supposing that Philip Howard emulated Francis Tregian. The Queen succeeded at first in making him a courtier, and withdrawing him from his wife. Her known character makes her conduct suspicious. The Earl baffled her by embracing the Catholic faith, although,

¹ *Records of the English Province*, i., 362.

as he afterwards told Fr. Southwell, “he resolved to become Catholick long before he could resolve to live as a Catholick”.¹ The Queen’s vengeance pursued him till he was beyond the reach of human malice. Cut off by her in the flower of his years from the society of a devoted wife, he meditated day and night on the mysteries of divine love, and so bore a martyrdom of heart with unwearied patience. He died on 19th October, 1595, not without suspicion of poison. Tudor cruelty had fallen heavily on his family: to him alone it brought the martyr’s crown. As he lay dying the Queen sent him a message to the effect that she would restore all she had taken away if he would only go once to her church.²

The perfect unity of Catholics in their faith did not extend to all the ways of practising it. English Catholics had been wont to fast on all Fridays in the year, excepting in Paschal time, and on certain vigils, and to abstain on Saturdays, the Rogation days, and St. Mark’s Day. In 1777 Pius VI. transferred the vigils throughout the year to the Wednesdays and Fridays in Advent, and abrogated the Friday fast in 1781. The abstinence on Saturdays, Rogation days, and St. Mark’s Day remained in force till 1830.³ The point was the

¹ *Lives of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, and of Anne Dacres, his Wife*, edited from the original MS. by the Duke of Norfolk, p. 19.

² *Ibid.*, p. 115.

³ Morris, *Two Missionaries under Elizabeth*, p. 22.

object of much controversy and some acrimony, owing to the well-meant intentions of Fr. Haywood, who, before Fr. Campion's death, tried to introduce the Roman custom. All persecutions tend more or less to produce factions. Elizabeth and her ministers went, so to speak, further than their persecution, for they created factions and then fed them sedulously. "Setting Christendom on fire" was the passion which only died with the Queen's life. The peculiar form which it took in her last years is instructive. The master-stroke of her policy against the Church was to stir up war between the secular and the regular clergy. Upon the nomination of a Jesuit superior to the English Seminary in Rome, Walsingham's emissaries were at hand to fan the tiny spark of latent jealousy till it burst into a flame. Some then of those ardent seminarists, who were preparing for the English mission and receiving St. Philip's greeting, *Salvete flores martyrum*, began to esteem their vocation to the secular priesthood as something higher and better than the call to the Society of Jesus. It was the adversary's plan to give them an over-weening consciousness of their own heroism. After Cardinal Allen's death (1594), the same contention invaded Wisbeach, and disturbed the quiet of the community life led by the prisoners, and presided over at that time by Fr. Weston, a Jesuit. Bagshawe, a turbulent spirit in the Roman Seminary, appeared at Wisbeach, and broke up the peace. He wanted his independence,

so far as he could have it, murmured at the restraint, and at the dominion of the Jesuits, for upon Cardinal Allen's death, one of their number practically headed the English Catholics. Walsingham, who died in 1590, had founded his tradition, or rather, grafted it on the existing stock,—his sovereign's love of intrigue. The malcontents at Wisbeach revealed their true character when one of their number unhappily apostatised.

Bancroft, the Anglican bishop of London, carefully walked in Walsingham's footsteps by fostering the dissensions between secular and regular. The clever tactics of the government resulted in the formation of a party known as the "Appellant Priests". The Privy Council favoured them for its own purposes, abetted and duped them.

In 1598 the Holy See took the important step of appointing an Archpriest for England with twelve assistants. George Blackwell was nominated to the post, and England, divided into twelve circuits, would be ecclesiastically supervised by one of the assistants. The Appellants were equally opposed to the Archpriest and to the Society of Jesus, and for this reason were patronised by Bancroft and the Queen. Contemporary evidence shows that, till the last, Elizabeth hoped to fish in the troubled waters, which she had stirred up. On 17th March, 1602, Fr. Rivers reported that: "She hath commanded this faction to be still nourished upon conceit, that thereby the College of Cardinals will be divided in

opinion (if it stay there) and therewithal the Pope be distracted from determining the controversy".¹

The Queen had not succeeded in stamping out the Catholic religion. Still less could she silence the authoritative voice of the Sovereign Pontiff, who, in July, 1602, gave judgment against the Appellants on all points at issue. The nature of their demands is discovered by the Papal decision. The powers and position of the Archpriest were maintained. The Jesuits were not recalled. All appeals in future were to be made directly to Rome, and no dealing with heretics was tolerated under pain of excommunication. The government, seeing that nothing further was to be gained, dropped its supposed friends, the Appellants, and showed its true colours.²

Its true colours were persecution to the death, yet happiness and joy were with the persecuted. It may be well to contrast the closing scene of those last executions at Tyburn under Elizabeth with the deepening gloom of her court. In every case the priest, attainted of high treason by a cruel and unjust statute, went to his terrible death joyfully, the eye of faith seeing beyond the mortal horrors which surrounded him. Women, too, longed to give their lives, and would not be consoled when reprieved. Fr. John Gerard describes Mrs. Anne Line "as a very godly and discreet matron of good birth, whom

¹ *Records of the English Province*, i., 23, 45.

² *Ibid.*, i., 12-18.

the Lord honoured with martyrdom,"¹ and he had placed her in charge of the house which he had hired for the reception of priests. She was now to prove the reality of her life-long desire to shed her blood for the Catholic faith, and she was the third woman under Elizabeth to suffer a traitor's death. She went to execution together with a Benedictine, Fr. Barkworth, and Fr. Filcock, a Jesuit, in 1601. The evidence against Anne for her crime of harbouring a priest was scarcely proved, but she made a full confession of having sinned against the spirit of the statute.

At Tyburn, when ready to die, "she declared to the standers-by with a loud voice: 'I am sentenced to die for harbouring a Catholic priest; and so far I am from repenting for having so done, that I wish, with all my soul, that where I have entertained one, I could have entertained a thousand'".²

The last priest to suffer under Elizabeth was William Richardson, a Seminary priest, who was hanged, drawn and quartered on 17th February, 1603.

For Elizabeth, too, the end was approaching. She, who had been a mistress in the art of dissembling, would have to be shorn of all her deceptions, and to appear at the great Judgment-seat, with the sole adornment of her good works. For forty-

¹ "Life of Fr. John Gerard," Preface to *Condition of Catholics under James I.*, lxxiii.

² Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, i., 215.

four years she had been the sun and centre of her court. At sixty-four, affecting youth and good looks, she would not hear the mention of sickness and death in connection with her own person. Wherever she cast her eyes the spectators fell on their knees, and all those who served her at table genuflected three times on approaching and retiring.¹ Homage and flattery palled upon her at last, and death was heralded by an awful sadness. The wretched Queen, on the threshold of eternity, might have envied the joy of her victims at Tyburn.

Statistics of the Recusants in the Northern Counties make it certain that from ten to fifty persons in every village were openly opposed to the New Religion, while hundreds conformed outwardly with secret loathing.² The consequences of Elizabeth's supremacy were apparent in the old churches, rifled and bare, which the multitude no longer viewed as their Father's house. Worship was transferred to the person of the Queen.

The number of Catholics put to death for their religion during the first thirty years of her reign was 204, whilst 1200 had been ruined, sent into banishment, or imprisoned by her laws.³ The first thirty years do not embrace the full measure of her penal code, since the statute of the 27th Elizabeth is the

¹ Lingard, viii., 402.

² Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth*, ii., 329.

³ Zimmermann, *Maria die Katholische*, p. 102.

most sanguinary on record. At the date of her death it had been for eighteen years in operation.

From the various accounts of Elizabeth's end we may conclude that she died as she had lived, without any true conversion of heart to God, in deep melancholy, and utter hopelessness.¹ She had surrounded herself with negations and died with them in her mouth. "I will not have any rascal's son to succeed me," were, it is said, her last words, before sinking into a death-like stupor. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift, was summoned by the Privy Council, and adjured the dying Queen to turn her thoughts to God and to eternity. He did not invite her to contrition, but rather to confidence, "for the admirable work of the Reformation" which she had happily accomplished. The sight of her Archbishop, however, conveyed no comfort to Elizabeth. The Queen was much offended when he appeared, says Lady Southwell, an eye-witness, bidding her Council, who had summoned ghostly aid, "be packing". She was no atheist, she said, yet she knew full well the Archbishop and the other prelates sent by the Privy Council "were but hedge priests".² If Elizabeth spoke these words even in delirium they revealed her secret mind, which was acute and penetrating in all its wickedness. An Archbishop whom she had created could not make the dry bones live, and she knew it.

¹ See Lingard, viii., 396; Collier, vii., 255; Lee, ii., 339.

² Agnes Strickland, *Queen Elizabeth*, vii., 294.

So she passed away at Richmond in the early morning of 24th March, 1603.

This world has glorified her because she was one of its own, but even her praise and renown have been given to a fictitious Elizabeth. History is now revealing the real Elizabeth, and removing the cunning devices of art, paint, and cosmetic by which she strove to appear what she was not. The deception has lasted for three centuries, branding the victims of Elizabeth with her very vices. Mary Stuart, whom she murdered, and the Catholic Church, which she would have stamped out could she have done her will, have borne the burden of her distinguishing characteristics,—immorality, cruelty and falseness.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES CONSULTED
AND
INDEX.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES CONSULTED.

A.

Archbold, Somerset Religious Houses.
Audin, Histoire de Henri VIII.

B.

Beesley, Queen Elizabeth.
 Bellasis, Mr. Serjeant, Was Barlow a Bishop ?
 Bellesheim, Dr. A., Geschichte der Kirche in Irland.
 „ Wilhelm, Kardinal Allen.
 Bois, A. du, Katherine d'Aragon et les Origines du Schisme Anglican.
 Brady, W. Maziere, Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland.
 Brewer, Calendar of State Papers, edited by.
 „ Reign of Henry VIII.
 „ English Studies.
 Bridgett, Fr., Life of Blessed Thomas More.
 „ „ Life of Blessed John Fisher.
 „ „ Our Lady's Dowry.
 „ „ Queen Elizabeth and the Catholic Hierarchy.
 Brown, Four years at the Court of Henry VIII; Selection of Despatches, etc.
 Burnet, History of the Reformation of the Church of England.
 Busch, England unter den Tudors.

2

Calendar of State Papers, edited by Gairdner.
Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series of Reign of Elizabeth,
 edited by Stevenson.
Calendar of State Papers (Spanish), edited by P. Gayangos.
Cassan, Lives of the Bishops of Winton.
 (2/2)

Challoner, Memoirs of Missionary Priests.
 Chronicle of Calais and of Queen Jane.
 Collier, Ecclesiastical History.
 Coverdale, Bishop, Works.

D.

Döllinger, Dr., Documente zur Geschichte Karl's V., Philip's II., und ihrer Zeit.
 Doreau, Dom V. M., Henri VIII. et les Martyrs de la Grande Chartreuse de Londres.
 Dormer, Jane, Duchess of Feria, Life of, edited by Esteourt and Stevenson.
 Durand de Laux, Erasme, Précurseur et Initiateur de l'Esprit Moderne.

E.

Ehses, Dr., Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehesheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England.
 Early English Text Society, England in the Reign of Henry VIII.

F.

Fiddes, Life of Wolsey.
 Flanagan, Canon, History of the Church in England.
 Friedmann, Anne Boleyn.
 Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.

G.

Gasquet, Dr., Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.
 " " Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer.
 Godwin, Bishop, De Præsulibus Angliæ.
 Gough, General Index to Parker Society.
 Green, History of the English People.

H.

Hall, Society in the Elizabethan Age.
 Harington, Sir J., Nugæ Antiquæ.

Harpsfield, N., *The Pretended Divorce between Henry VIII. and Katherine of Aragon.*
 Hayward, *Annals of Queen Elizabeth.*
 Hergenröther, *Kardinal, Kirchenlexicon.*
 Heylin, P., *History of the Reformation of the Church of England.*
 Hooker, *Works*, edited by Keble.
 Hope, Mrs., *Franciscan Martyrs in England.*
 Hutton, Rev. A., *Anglican Ministry.*

J.

Janssen, Dr., *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes.*
 Jessop, *One Generation of a Norfolk House.*
 „ *Visitation of the Diocese of Norwich, 1492-1532.*
 Jewell, Bishop, *Works.*

K.

Kerker, M., *Reginald Pole, ein Lebensbild.*
 Kerwyn de Lettenhove, *Relations Politiques des Pays Bas et de l'Angleterre.*
 Kinloch, Miss, *History of the Church in Scotland.*
 Knight, *Life of Dean Colet.*
 Knox, Fr., *Douay Diaries.*

L.

Lee, Dr., *Church under Queen Elizabeth.*
 „ „ *Edward VI., Supreme Head.*
 Lindsay, Honourable C., *Mary Stuart.*
 Lingard, *History of England.*

M.

Machyn, *Diary of (Camden Society).*
 Madden, Sir F., *Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary.*
 Marsys, Sieur de, *La Persécution Présente des Catholiques en Angleterre.*
 Moran, Cardinal, *History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin.*

Morris, Rev. J., *Condition of Catholics under James I.*
 " " *Catholics of Yorkshire under Elizabeth.*
 " " *Records of the English Province.*
 " " *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers.*
 " " *Two Missionaries under Elizabeth.*
 Moyses, Canon, *Dublin Review* for April, 1894.
 Mullinger, *History of University of Cambridge.*

N.

National Biography.
 Norfolk, Duke of, *Lives of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel and of Anne Dacres, his wife.*

P.

Parker, Archbishop, *Correspondence of (Parker Society).*
 Pilkington, Bishop, *Works (Parker Society).*
 Pocock, N., *Records of the Reformation.*
 Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents.*

S.

Sanders, *Anglican Schism*, edited by D. Lewis.
 Sandys, Archbishop, *Sermons (Parker Society).*
 Simpson, *Life of Edmund Campion.*
 Smith, Rev. Sydney, *How the Church of England Washed Her Face.*
 Spillmann, Rev. J., *Die Englischen Martyrer unter Heinrich VIII.*
 " " *Die Englischen Martyrer unter Elizabeth.*
 Stevenson, Rev. J., *Henry VIII., Articles in Month, 1882-1883.*
 Stone, Miss, *Faithful unto death.*
 Strickland, Agnes, *Queen Elizabeth.*
 Strype, *Life of Archbishop Parker.*
 " *Life of Grindal.*
 " *Life of Whitgift.*

W.

Weldon, *Chronological Notes.*
 Wiesener, *La Jeunesse d'Elizabeth.*
 Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii.

Z.

Zimmermann, Rev. A., Kardinal Pole.

„ „ Maria die Katholische.

„ „ England's öffentlichen Schulen von der
Reformation bis zur Gegenwart.

Zurich Letters (Parker Society).

INDEX.

A.

Allen, William, 154 ; Cardinal, 155, 218 ; his admonition, 218.
Anne of Cleves, 69.
Appellant Priests, 235, 236.
Armada, Invincible, 218, 219, 220.
Arthur, Prince, 2 ; his marriage, 23.
Articles, Six, 71.
Aske, Robert, 66, 67.
Augmentation, Court of, 59.

B.

Babington Conspiracy, 216, 217.
Bale, Bishop of Ossory, 78.
Barkley of Bath and Wells, 171.
Barlow, Bishop of St. David's, 79 ; consecrator of Parker, 144 ; a heretic, 164.
Black Book, 58.
Blackwell, George, nominated Archpriest, 235.
Boleyn, Anne, appearance at court, 13 ; her influence, 14 ; ruined and executed, 54, 55.
Bonner, Bishop of London, 82, 103.
Book of 1559, 141.
Brown, George, officiator at Anne Boleyn's marriage, 39 ; Arch-bishop of Dublin, 77.
Bucer on Book of 1552, 107.

C.

Campeggio in England 1518, 15, 26 ; at Legatine Court, 28.
Campion, Blessed Edmund, 204, 206, 207, 208 ; his execution, 209 ; his companions, 210.
Cannon Row Commission, 133.

Carthusian Priors, 47 ; Carthusian martyrs, 51.
 Cecil, his character, 133 ; a diplomatist, 152 ; his policy, 161.
 Charles V., 19.
 Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester, 178.
 Circiniana, frescoes by, 162.
 Clement VII., his policy, 19, 24 ; at Orvieto, 25.
 Clement VIII., on Hooker, 227.
 Clergy, secular, martyrs of, 52.
 Clitheroe, Venerable Margaret, 214, 215.
 Colet, Dean, a humanist, 9 ; in Convocation, 10.
 Constantinople, taking of, 5.
 Convocation in Catholic times, 91.
 Council of North, 192.
 Coverdale, 144, 173.
 Cox, Bishop of Ely, 170, 171.
 Cranmer, Thomas, chosen Archbishop, 37 ; his character, 38 ; his Order for Communion, 92 ; his Prayer-Book, 94, 95 ; his Ritual 98 ; his Ordinal, 102 ; second Book, 105 ; burnt, 123
 Cromwell, Thomas, Secretary of State, 32 ; author of Royal Supremacy, 33, 34 ; fall of, 71.
 Curwen of Oxford, 174.
 Cuthbert, St., desecration of his shrine, 68.

D.

Day, Bishop of Chichester, 103.
 Dungeons, sufferings of, 229.
 Durham, Bishopric of, refounded, 114.

E.

Edward VI., accession, 86 ; his death, 108.
 Elizabeth's Hierarchy, 181, 182, 226 ; her death, 240.
 Erasmus, the Voltaire of his day, 8 ; his character, 9.

F.

Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster at Wisbeach, 140.
 Felton, Blessed John, 191.
 Ferdinand of Spain, 5.
 Field of Cloth of Gold, 7.
 Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, 11 ; champion of Katherine, 29 ; a Cardinal and martyr, 48.

Forest, Blessed John, 52.
 Fortescue, Venerable Adrian, 53.
 Fox, Bishop of Winchester, 3, 24, 25.
 Francis I, 6 ; character and policy, 19.
 Franciscan Observants, 51.
 Friaries, 62.

G.

Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, his confessorship, 89 ; in the Fleet and Tower, 91 ; on Prayer Book, 104 ; at St. Paul's Cross, 118.
 Genings, Fr. Edmund, martyr, 230.
 Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, 183.
 Gregory XIII., 201, 202.
 Grey, Lady Jane, proclaimed, 109 ; executed, 112.
 Grindal, Bishop of London under Elizabeth, 147, 167 ; his Injunctions, 168 ; his opinions, 223.
 Gubernatrix Ecclesiae, 136.

H.

Heath, Bishop of Worcester, deprived, 107 ; Archbishop of York, his action, 131 ; in Tower, 184.
 Henry VII., his policy, 1, 2.
 Henry VIII., *Fidei Defensor*, 13 ; death of, 84.
 Hierarchy, Catholic, imprisoned, 184, 185.
 Hobbes, Abbot of Woburn, 64.
 Hooker, 226, 227.
 Houghton, Blessed John, 50.
 Howard, Venerable Philip, 232, 233.
 Humanists, later, their character, 11.
 Huntingdon, Earl of, 193.

I.

Isabella, Queen of Spain, 5.

J.

James V. of Scotland, 79.
 Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury, 170 ; on Mass, 177.
 Julius II., Bull of, 3 ; Brief of, 24.
 Julius III., Bull to Cardinal Pole, 117.

K.

Katherine of Aragon, bride of Arthur, 2, 23 ; before Legates, 29 ; her death, 53.
 Katherine Howard, Queen, 71 ; her execution, 74.
 Katherine Parr, Queen, 81.
 Kirby, Fr., martyr, 210, 211.
 Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, 139.

L.

Latimer, burnt, 122.
 Legatine Court, 28.
 Lime, Mrs. Anne, martyr, 236, 237.
 Loftus, Adam, Archbishop of Armagh, 175.
 Luther, his revolt, 7.

M.

Maid of Kent, 42.
 Maine, Blessed Cuthbert, 196, 197.
 Margaret Plantagenet, 70, 74.
 Mary, Princess, 5 ; Queen, 110 ; coronation, 113 ; her marriage, 116 ; her restorations, 126 ; her death, 130.
 Mary Stuart, consort of France, regnant of Scotland, 157 ; imprisoned, 217 ; her death, 218.
 Mary Tudor, Queen of France, 13.
 Mass abolished, 176.
 Misprision of treason, what, 42.
 Monasteries, suppressions of, 56, 57.
 More, Blessed Thomas, his mind, 10 ; chancellor, 32 ; resignation of office, 35 ; at Lambeth, 46 ; his death, 49.

N.

Norfolk, Duke of, and Mary Stuart, 158.
 Northumberland, Duke of, his execution, 111.
 Northumberland, Earl of, a martyr, 161.

O.

Oath of Allegiance and Homage, 182.
 Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, 134, 135.

P.

Parker, Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, 143 ; his consecration, 145, 146 ; a jailer, 186 ; his Erastianism, 224.
Parkhurst of Norwich, 172.
Parsons, Fr., 204, 206.
Paul IV., Pope, 127 ; his policy, 128.
Penal enactments against Catholics, 153, 205, 212, 213, 238.
Peyto, Franciscan Observant, nominated Cardinal, 129.
Philip of Spain, 116.
Pilgrimage of Grace, 66 ; under Elizabeth, 101.
Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, 166 ; on Mass, 177.
Pius IV., to Elizabeth, 150, 151.
Pius V., his Bull against Elizabeth, 163, 188, 190.
Pius VI. and English Catholics, 233.
Pole, Reginald, 36 ; legate *a latere*, 117 ; Archbishop of Canterbury, 123 ; invalidates all Anglican ordinations, 124.
Protestants under Mary, 119, 120.

Q.

Quadra, de, Bishop of Avila, to Pius IV., 149 ; on Elizabeth, 150.

R.

Recusants, why, 137.
Richardson, William, martyr, 237.
Richmond, Duke of, 5.
Ridley, 88 ; at St. Paul's, 104 ; burnt, 122.
Risings in North, 65, 67.
Roses, Wars of, 1, 2.

S.

Sacraments, two in Prayer Book, 96.
Salisbury, Countess of, 53.
Sampson, popular preacher, 179.
Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, 169 ; translated to London, thence to York, 169.
Seminary at Douai, 155 ; at Rheims, 156 ; in Rome, 201.
Seymour, Jane, 54.
Sixtus V. and Philip II., 219.

Smithfield, heretics burnt at, 121.
 Southwell, Fr. Robert, 231, 232.
 Standish, Bishop of St. Asaph, 29.
 Staples, Bishop of Meath, 78.
 Supremacy, Oath of, 45.
 Supremacy, Royal, by Act of Parliament, 40, 41, 43.
 Suppressions by attainder, 61.
 Synod of Westminster, 125.

T.

Thirty-nine Articles, 151, 152.
 Thomas of Canterbury, St., cited by Henry VIII., 75; his shrine desecrated, 76.
 Topcliffe, priest hunter, 231.
 Torture, instruments of, in Tower, 199, 200.
 Tregian, Francis, 197, 198.
 Trent, Council of, 151.
 Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, 87; in prison, 107.

U.

University of Oxford in 1559, 148.

V.

Vagabonds, how punished, 99.
 Valladolid, Seminary at, 230.
 Vavasour, Dr., 228.

W.

Walpole, Henry, Jesuit and martyr, 209.
 Walsingham Priory, suppressed, 68.
 Walsingham's tactics, 211; emissaries, 234.
 Ward, Margaret, martyr, 215, 222.
 Warham, his policy, 12; in Convocation 1531, 35; his protest and death, 37.
 Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, sent to Tower, 139; his death, 203.
 White, Bishop of Winchester, sent to Tower, 139.
 Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, at Elizabeth's death-bed, 239.
 Whiting, Venerable Richard, Abbot of Glastonbury, 63.
 Windsor Commission, 93.

Wisbeach Castle, a prison, 203, 234.

Wolsey, his origin and rise, 6; home policy, 15, 22; foreign policy, 15, 18, 20; his suppressions, 16, 17; at Grafton, 31; his disgrace and death, 31, 32.

Woodhouse, Thomas, martyr, 195.

Wyat, insurrection of, 115.



Allies, Mary Helen A

BQX
2055

History of the Church
in England A.D. 1509-1603

A44

